THE PROCEEDINGS

of

The South Carolina Historical Association

1979

WILLIAM S. BROCKINGTON, JR.
W. CALVIN SMITH

Editors

USC - AIKEN
THE SOUTH CAROLINA
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1979-1980

President
CARLANNA L. HENDRICK
Francis Marion College

Vice-President
JAMIE W. MOORE
The Citadel

Secretary-Treasurer
A.V. HUFF, JR.
Furman University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
(In addition to the officers named above)

JOHN B. EDMUNDS
University of South Carolina - Spartanburg

WALTER B. EDGAR
University of South Carolina - Columbia

M. FOSTER FARLEY
Newberry College

JEFFREY R. WILLIS
Converse College

Representative, Archives Commission
JOAB M. LESESNE, JR.
Wofford College

Editors, The Proceedings
WILLIAM S. BROCKINGTON, JR.
W. CALVIN SMITH
University of South Carolina - Aiken

THE PROCEEDINGS

of

The South Carolina Historical Association

1979

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

MINUTES

South Carolina Historical Association

Annual Meeting - 1979

The Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting convened on the campus of Clemson University on Saturday, April 7, 1979. After registration and a pleasant coffee hour beginning at 9:00 A.M., in Hardin Hall, the Association met at 10:00 A.M., Joseph Wightman, presiding.

There were two morning sessions. A session on United States history included papers on the "Political System of Charleston Between 1900 and 1920" by Doyle Boggs of the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg and "Slave or Super Slave: Who Really Did Labor in the Southern Cotton Fields" by William F. Steirer, Jr., of Clemson. W.J. Fraser, Jr., of The Citadel commented. A World History session featured "The Low Countries and the Quest for a Negotiated Peace, 1939-1940" by Birdsall Viault of Winthrop and "Protestants and the Anti-Conscription Campaigns, 1940-1960," by Joe P. Dunn of Converse. Comments were made by Alice Henderson of USC - Spartanburg.

The Luncheon Meeting followed in Shilletter Hall. The minutes were approved, and the Secretary-Treasurer made the Financial Report. The officers for 1979-80 were elected by acclamation:

President:	Carlanna Hendrick (Francis Marion)
Vice-President:	Jamie W. Moore (The Citadel)
Secretary-Treasurer:	A.V. Huff, Jr. (Furman)
Executive Committee:	M. Foster Farley (Newberry) Jeffrey R. Willis (Converse)
Editor, <u>Proceedings</u>:	Peter Neil Barry (USC - Lancaster)

After some discussion, it was decided that the Fiftieth Anniversary meeting (1980) would be held in Columbia at the

University of South Carolina. The 1981 meeting will be held at The Citadel.

Robert S. Lambert of Clemson read a memorial to deceased founding member, Carl Epting. He moved it be included in the Proceedings. The motion was seconded and adopted.

The afternoon session on South Carolina History convened at 2:00 P.M. Robert F. Martin of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill presented the "Origin, Development and Significance of the Holiness and Pentecostal Revival in South Carolina in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century." Nancy T. Matthews read a paper on "The Duel in South Carolina." Selden Smith, Columbia College, commented on the first paper; G. Wayne King of Francis Marion, the second.

At 5:00 P.M. Clemson entertained the Association in the Penthouse of the Clemson House. The Dinner meeting convened at 6:15 P.M. and the Honorable Dean Rusk of the University of Georgia addressed the group.

A.V. Huff, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer

CARL LAFAYETTE EPTING (1898-1978)

A native of Chapin, South Carolina, Carl Epting was graduated from Newberry College in 1921, received his M.A. from the University of South Carolina in 1924, and did further graduate work at the University of South Carolina and the University of North Carolina.

He began his career in college teaching at Clemson College in 1925; after serving on the faculties of Wofford College and Columbia College, he returned to Clemson in 1938 where he rose in rank to Professor of History and Government. For sixteen years until his retirement in 1963 he served as Acting Head and Head of the Department of Social Sciences. In that year he moved to Spartanburg where for five years he taught history and supervised student teachers in the social studies at Converse College.

One of the charter members when this association was formed in 1931, Carl published in its Proceedings and served as its vice president and president. In recent years he had edited the revised edition of the D.D. Wallace set of South Carolina history maps for Denoyer Geppert.

Carl Epting had a parallel career in public service, as a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives in the 1933-1934 term and as Intendant of the Town of Clemson. For many years a member of the South Carolina Historical Commission and The Archives and History Commission, he was its vice chairman when he retired from Clemson.

We have missed our gracious and patient colleague since he left Clemson many years ago, but a high point in the year was to see him again at meetings of this association each spring. Last October Carl died in Spartanburg in his eighty-first year. Historian, teacher and administrator, public servant and civic leader, humane gentleman and a foxhunter, and founding and contributing member of this association, he will be missed.

CHARLESTON POLITICS, 1900-1930: AN OVERVIEW

Doyle W. Boggs

In 1924, James F. Byrnes made his first try for statewide office in South Carolina when he opposed incumbent Nathaniel B. Dial and Coleman L. Blease for a United States Senate seat in the Democratic primary. Since the famous "Coley" could be counted upon to receive 40 percent of the vote, Byrnes's strategy was to campaign against Dial in the hope of winning the spot opposite Blease in the run-off. If past patterns held, the young Congressman could then count on victory, since a narrow but comfortable majority of South Carolinians would have voted for Blease only if he were running against a black, a Catholic, or the devil.

The story of this run-off election is widely known. Out of Charleston came the famous "kiss of death," an advertisement in one of the city's newspapers from a group of former acolytes at St. Patrick's Catholic Church.[1] They described how much they admired Byrnes for his boyhood devotion to the Catholic faith, and how strongly they supported him against Blease. When Blease followers circulated this news around the state during the weekend before the election, Byrnes's protests that he was now a good Episcopalian did him no good, and Blease gained 17,800 votes over his first primary total. Since Byrnes lost by only 2500 votes, the "kiss of death" is often considered a masterful political stroke by Blease and his statewide organization.[2]

The irony of the "kiss of death" circular, however, is that it was produced by a peculiar situation in Charleston that had at least as much to do with a local political race as it did with the statewide primary. In a heated campaign for a seat in the United States House of Representatives from the Charleston area, the Ku Klux Klan had been extremely active, and its candidate received more than one-fourth of the total vote. In the run-off, this vote waivered between the candidate of Mayor Thomas Stoney, who was Thomas McMillan, and W. Turner Logan, the incumbent Congressman and law partner of the notorious John P. Grace. Since Stoney was supporting Byrnes for the Senate, Grace and his followers hoped to help Logan by damaging Byrnes's standing with both Klan and Catholic voters. In spite of the impact of this strategy in the statewide primary, Charleston voters were used to such dirty tricks and gave McMillan a comfortable victory.[3]

From this episode, it becomes clear that it is dangerous to write twentieth century South Carolina political history without a clear understanding of what was happening in the port city. Although it is true that Charleston politics were characterized by corruption and clashes between urban machines, it also explored such issues as the role of government in education, transportation, and public utilities; moral reform; and the best way to revive a city which in 1900 had been what John J. Duffy called "a stinking, rotten, poverty-stricken, ill-governed town, better known for its vices than its virtues."[4] The purpose of this paper is to briefly examine the origin, structure and tactics of the Charleston machines, and to review briefly how they affected South Carolina politics between 1900 and 1930.

Several factors contributed to the development of machines in twentieth century Charleston. The first of these was an economic depression caused by railroad discrimination, a general lack of industrial development, the collapse of rice growing and phosphate mining, and natural disasters.

A second cause was growing class, racial and ethnic tension. Turn of the century Charleston could be divided into four separate sections: "uptown" neighborhoods which housed newcomers from the rural areas; working class streets along the Cooper River which were home to a considerable number of Irish and Italian families; white collar neighborhoods along the Ashley River; and the section known as "South of Broad," where Charleston's aristocracy clung to their pre-Revolutionary houses and some of the same social customs. Until 1920, the majority of Charleston's population was black. Historians have frequently commented on the fact that there do not seem to have been any segregated housing patterns or racial violence before 1900, and Jim Crow laws came only after lengthy and heated debates in City Council and the newspapers. However, as the city absorbed both black and white newcomers during a period of increasing racial tension, a continuing theme of twentieth century Charleston history was the collapse of this good feeling. In 1919, there was a severe racial disturbance in which gangs of sailors armed with lead pipes and guns surged through the streets looking for blacks. Two Negroes were killed, twelve more were hospitalized with bullet wounds while another forty had to be treated for head injuries.

Charleston machines also owed a debt to the statewide intensification of political strife caused by the rise of Benjamin Ryan Tillman. Elected governor of South Carolina in 1890 in an election that reflected the distress of the small farmers of the state, Pitchfork Ben had a strong following in the outlying areas of Charleston County as well as in the uptown wards of the city, and a Tillman supporter actually served as mayor of Charleston from 1891 to 1895. During this administration, an important new figure was introduced to Charleston. He was J. Elmore Martin, a Tillmanite from Edgefield who was named Chief of Police. However, Tillman's hopes for permanent control over Charleston were dashed by the controversy over liquor which ended with the establishment of the Dispensary in 1893. While the new law offered consumers a sixty-cent reduction in the price of a pint of liquor, Charlestonians bitterly resented the closure of restaurant bars and neighborhood taverns. By the time Mayor J. Adger Smyth was elected in 1895, the state package stores were in fact serving as wholesale distributors for numerous illegal saloons or blind tigers. In an effort to maintain this system, Smyth attempted to remove Martin as Chief of Police. However, Governor John Gary Evans took direct control of the situation under terms of a special Metropolitan Police Act, and reinstated Martin as head of the department. Taking advantage of this reprieve to build his strength in the suburbs and outlying areas, Martin won election as Sheriff of Charleston County in 1898 and was the dominant figure in county politics for the next twenty years. Nevertheless, Evans's action effectively destroyed the Tillman organization within the city, and not even the Senator's securing of the Navy Yard in 1902 revived it.[5]

With home rule looming as the major issue in Charleston municipal politics, Charleston voters elected Robert Goodwyn Rhett as the first twentieth century mayor of the city.

Though he was a nephew of the famous secessionist Robert Barnwell Rhett, his image was that of a progressive. Rhett was a successful businessman who had recouped a shattered family fortune through the phosphate industry and various banking and real estate interests, and he wanted to apply these business principles to the government of the city. Among his achievements were achieving a budget surplus of more than $12,000 by 1911 and the launching of the Boulevard project, which involved draining and offering for sale some choice residential lots along the Ashley River. Rhett also managed to defuse the liquor controversy by instituting what was called "the fine-licensing system." Under this dispensation, police raided the blind tigers on a quarterly basis, with the owners pleading guilty to violations of the Dispensary Law. The fine was usually $25 for serving Dispensary liquor or $150 for bootlegging. This system provided City Hall with a needed source of revenue, gave police a measure of control over the tigers, and delighted Dispensary officials because it meant that the temptation to buy the cheaper moonshine was greatly reduced.[6]

For eight years after 1903, then, Charleston was governed by a business and financial elite inspired by a progressive program and made confident by a truce with state authorities. However, in 1911 this calm was shattered. In a masterful campaign that linked labor groups, disaffected ethnic blocs and the old city Tillmanites into a smoothly functioning machine, a young Charleston lawyer of Irish extraction named John P. Grace swept into the mayor's office. To some it seemed that Charleston had experienced a revolution. "Down go the Bourbons and the people rule," newspaper editor Thomas R. Waring wrote. "I don't think Charleston will suffer in the long run. We are become a modern American city and must go through all the stages of development that implies."[7]

If Waring was thinking about machine politics when he wrote his letter, he certainly was correct. Grace was an extremely gifted urban politician in the Irish-American tradition operating in a city which showed the usual urban tendencies toward corruption and bloc voting, exacerbated by a one-party system and a partisan police force composed of spoilsmen. Morever, Charleston was a city which enjoyed machine politics, so the tendency of all leaders was to refine their organizations rather than reform them.

In Charleston, as in the state as a whole, the most important political institution was the white Democratic primary.[8] In the absence of an effective Republican or Populist party, the winner of this primary was assured of a routine victory in the general election. Neither statewide primaries nor the municipal contests held in cities like Charleston were subjected to the regulation of the courts or the government. Instead, the primary was operated like a private club with officials elected by conventions designated to run on appeals and ensure fair election. In a place like Charleston, the key to winning an election was often not the support of the majority of the voters but control of this election machinery, the Democratic Executive Committee.

An example of how this committee influenced the primary election may be found in the system for the registration of voters. After it had been chosen by the city or county convention about six months prior to the election, the Democratic Executive Committee appointed poll managers who would control registration procedures, oversee the voting, and ensure a supposedly honest tabulation of the ballots. The committee was responsible for purging the rolls of voters who had been incorrectly registered, had died, or had moved. It was also charged with ruling on any challenges which materialized after an election. Prior to 1914, the poll manager simply kept the Democratic roll books at his home, store, or blind tiger. Since he could be relied upon to know most of the men in his club, many voters were registered more or less automatically. Others were enrolled by friends or candidate's canvassers. Charleston also faced the problem of "floaters," or multiple registrants, a practice that became more common during the 1920's when the Nineteenth Amendment made it possible to use prostitutes for this purpose.

Even after the club rolls were purged and certified, there were still possibilities for corruption. Election day was generally a nightmare for the candidate who did not control the managers. The poll manager had to place an official stamp on the ballot before it could be counted, and he generally tried to avoid doing so if he suspected the voter might be hostile. Managers also frequently mutilated ballots which they wished to throw out. Once the polls closed, the ballot boxes were opened and extra ballots could be added. While the votes were being counted and tallied, a skillful manager could call a vote incorrectly or slip a ballot back into the uncounted pile. The tally clerk had to be watched to make sure he did not improperly mark the tally sheet by such procedures as making a tally when only four votes had been counted. After counting was done, selected ballots often disappeared, leaving open the possibility of a fraud on a recount.

The only defense open to a candidate against these frauds, which were collectively known as "counting short," was an active and experienced poll watcher. It was always the goal of the faction in control of the election machinery to drive the watchers of the other side from the polls. Often this task would be done by the Charleston police, a notoriously partisan force made up of political appointees. They were often used to eject voters from the polls, act as canvassers, or even make carefully timed mass arrests of anti-administration voters.

Charleston elections were extremely costly. For example, after the 1911 campaign for mayor, candidates revealed that they spent almost $6700 between them, more than one dollar for each vote. In addition to these legal expenditures, Charleston candidates sought and received votes in exchange for such items as drinks, dollar bills, pairs of shoes, dresses, hams, and buckets of lard. In one election, votes in Ward 9 were said to be selling for $60 each, and more than $5,000 was alleged to have been distributed by J.J. O'Shaughnessy, who carried the bankroll in a copy of the club roll.[9]

To fully exploit all these opportunities to gain an electoral advantage, Sheriff Martin, Rhett, and Grace had all developed well-managed organizations by 1911. In Grace's case, the anchors of the machine were two east-side wards controlled by liquor dealer Vincent Chicco and John I. Cosgrove, Grace's law partner and protégé. Uptown, a typical Grace leader was H. Frank Hogan, better known as "Rumpty Rattles." A sometime stevedore, foreman of a dock gang, baseball player and boxer, Hogan really preferred politics to work and was a man to whom the promise of a municipal job held special appeal. Hogan's unsavory reputation was underscored when he was gunned down from ambush as he left a Market Street restaurant on October 25, 1927. The jury acquitted his assailant on a verdict of self defense.[10]

Held together by strong canvassing and the appeal of the spoils system, these organizations could be quickly activated for elections. In a 1913 election, both factions assembled organizations in Ward 9 with more than one hundred members. Therefore, almost half the ward's 450 electors were working for one side or the other. When these organizations assembled for political rallies, they usually provided the ward with its social highlight of the year. As one politician remembered: "They consist of a few remarks by the candidate or a few friends, generally followed by some local talent and the inevitable adjournment to refreshment, when the fun begins. The purpose of the meeting is forgotten and everything is drowned in cheers for the candidate for whom the meeting is being held."[11]

Even with the growing sophistication of the machines, it seemed that their injection into South Carolina state politics might be avoided until 1914. By then, Grace was in deep political trouble. Philosophically, he was an urban liberal who approached the problems of Charleston from the perspective of Al Smith rather than Henry Grady, and among his programs were a tuition-free College of Charleston, municipal ownership of the waterfront and other utilities, and a greatly expanded effort to pave the streets of the city. However, he admitted this program would require higher taxes and an increased municipal debt. Where Rhett had attempted to reach understanding with state authorities on such delicate issues as the Dispensary Law, Grace adopted a policy of defiance. Wracked by internal bickering, the Grace machine suffered serious political setbacks in races for the Sheriff of Charleston County and the United States House of Representatives at the hands of the combined forces of Rhett and Martin. All these considerations drove Grace, a locally oriented politician with a positive program, into an alliance with the controversial ex-Governor Blease just before the 1914 statewide Democratic primary.

The first primary that year was a disaster for Grace. Not only did Ellison D. Smith crush Blease in the United States Senate race, but Rhett and Martin decided to support Richard I. Manning over Robert A. Cooper in a choice between two able and progressive candidates. Manning carried Charleston by 700 votes, barely enough for him to edge Cooper for second place in the balloting and placing him in the runoff against Blease candidate John G. Richards.[12] In the September 9 runoff, Manning carried forty-two of the state's forty-six counties and easily won the Governor's Mansion.

An understanding of Manning's debt to the Rhett-Martin combination sheds a new light on the battle between Grace and the governor in 1915. For example, Manning's highly praised efforts to suppress the liquor trade in Charleston occurred during the middle of a hotly contested municipal campaign and helped thwart Grace's efforts to be re-elected. As the campaign neared its end, law enforcement in Charleston was taken away from the police force and turned over to state constables directly controlled by Sheriff Martin, a step that of course had a tremendous political impact, however lofty the motivation. The intervention from Columbia ended with mobilization of the National Guard to supervise the polls on election day, and Grace was narrowly defeated by T.T. Hyde, a candidate without a platform who served as a front for Martin and Rhett. The campaign ended with a bizarre shooting incident in which the ballot boxes were thrown into a Charleston street, preventing a recount.[13]

Manning's conduct during the campaign sealed the Blease-Grace alliance, and Charleston became the center of the ex-Governor's organization. Grace began publishing a daily newspaper, the Charleston American, and also joined such extremist Irish-American groups as the Friends of Irish Freedom. As a publisher, he vehemently criticized American entry into World War I. His counsel seems to have been important in influencing Blease to launch his ill-fated anti-war campaign for the Senate in 1917 and 1918. In these enterprises, Grace was again hounded by the Manning administration in Columbia. Urging federal authorities to suppress the American as a "treasonable sheet," Council of Defense Chairman David R. Coker painted a picture of Charleston as a "hotbed of conspiracy" against the United States.

It came as a rude shock to Blease's enemies, then, when Grace returned to power in Charleston in 1919. He successfully overcame the stigma of his war record with a classic campaign in which Thomas R. Waring said the machine ran "without a cylinder missing."[14] When Grace's law partner won a race for the United States House of Representatives the next year, Blease was encouraged to revive a political career which everyone believed had ended with the drubbing by Dial in the 1918 Senate race. Running for Governor in 1922, Blease cruised to a good lead over former Lieutenant Governor Thomas G. MacLeod, carrying twenty-two of the forty-six counties.[15]

Facing the possibility of Blease in the Governor's mansion, opposition leaders developed a change in strategy which not only resulted in MacLeod's victory, but ensured that the first primary would stand as the high water mark of Grace's career. The plan involved flooding the state with attacks on the Charleston mayor, who was to be portrayed as an urban boss, a wet, and above all, a Catholic. It was dirty politics, admitted William Watts Ball, who described Grace as "a better man than Blease ...in his personal life clean but passionate and fanatical." According to Ball, Grace supported Blease only out of political necessity and implied that the mayor deserved a better fate than to be destroyed for the sole purpose of keeping Blease out of office. Nevertheless, the objective of defeating Blease fully justified exploiting what Ball called Grace's "numerous problems," including prohibition, the Irish question, support of the Dyer anti-lynching bill, and finally, the fact that the anti-Catholic vote would be extremely important in Charleston as well as the upcountry.[16] The effectiveness of this strategy became obvious in the results of the run-off primary. MacLeod made stunning gains in the Piedmont, and became the first candidate to win 100,000 votes in a South Carolina election. Blease received 47 percent of the vote and went down to defeat.[17]

Although Martin's machine collapsed when the sheriff died and Hyde was finished as a candidate, anti-Grace forces took heart at the outcome of the 1922 governor's race. Stepping forward to challenge the mayor was Thomas P. Stoney, a youthful man who proposed to put an end to machine politics. He was capable both of breaking Grace's hold on the heavily protestant uptown wards and winning the support of the business interests because of his law practice and family connections. He was also a gifted campaigner who was very much Grace's equal on the stump. In one notable exchange, Grace charged that Stoney was a "gadfly." Stoney "informed the audience that he had looked the word up in the dictionary and found that a gadfly was an insect which attacked cattle. Stoney said he didn't know whether Grace was a heifer or a steer, but he sure was full of bull."[18]

In spite of his campaign promises, Stoney had no intention of changing the rules of the game of Charleston politics. All of Grace's policemen were replaced by spoilsmen, and the curruption in the uptown wards was as rampant as ever. Though Grace could no longer command a majority of the voters of Charleston, he did keep an opposition organization intact and he and his faithful five thousand followers made a considerable difference in South Carolina during the following decade. As noted above, the Charleston situation was extremely crucial in the 1924 Senate race between Blease and Byrnes, and Grace's support was so essential to John G. Richards's victory in the 1926 gubernatorial election that he gave the ex-mayor control of Charleston's state patronage and appointed him to the South Carolina Highway Commission.[19]

The major issue in that struggle was a $65 million state bond issue for highway construction. Although there was no doubt that a greater effort in road building was needed, there were charges that the bond issue was unconstitutional because it had not been submitted to the voters in a referendum. Also, Piedmont voters felt that the plan was discriminatory because most of the money would go for paving and construction in underdeveloped areas along the coast. Promising not to issue any of the road bonds, state Representative Olin D. Johnston of Spartanburg led the field in the first primary, and supporters of the bond issue turned to his opponent, Ibra C. Blackwood. As it turned out, Blackwood enjoyed the support of both Stoney and Grace in Charleston. He carried the county by 10,398 votes to only 2,638 for Johnston in the first count. Johnston cried that he had been counted short, and with good reason. He had a strong Charleston organization led by his former Wofford College roommate, State Senator J.C. Long, and he was given at least an even chance to hold his own in the uptown wards of the city. Given this fact, returns such as the Ward 11 box with 1550 votes for Blackwood and 352 for Johnston were simply incredulous. The importance of these peculiar returns from Charleston becomes clearer when one notes that throwing out just this one box would have reversed the result of a primary which was decided by 700 votes statewide. It was no wonder that the Blackwood forces rushed to have the state Democratic Executive Committee certify the results and then quickly burned the Charleston ballots in a wild celebration at Hibernian Hall.[20]

It was not until the 1931 mayor's race that a new day dawned in Charleston politics. As the fall primary drew near, a committee of bankers and businessmen reported that the city was on the verge of bankruptcy. "Why man, this town can't afford another one of its crazy campaigns," the News and Courier commented; "Taxes must be reduced or people can't live here."[21] The businessmen and bankers suggested a fusion ticket headed by Burnett R. Maybank, a wealthy young businessman who had served as an alderman in the Stoney administration. Although Grace claimed he was misled in matters of patronage and eventually put up his own candidate for mayor in opposition to the fusion ticket, Maybank was elected by a landslide. This triumph by Maybank was a true reflection of the changing political times. As Grace in 1911 had represented the rising power of the urban working class and Stoney in 1923 had represented the prejudice-haunted South Carolina of the twenties, Maybank's election heralded the arrival of the politics of depression. In spite of Maybank's capable management, he was unable to solve the financial crisis he had inherited from Stoney and Grace, and Charleston was bankrupt after the bank holding its deposits failed in January 1932. It was not until the coming of the New Deal that Charleston began to recover. By 1936, the Roosevelt administration had pumped $3.25 million into the city through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Civil Works Administration alone. More than 3,600 Charlestonians found work on New Deal projects. Building around this influx of New Deal money, Maybank and Senator Byrnes constructed a machine which controlled Charleston far more thoroughly than Rhett, Grace, or Stoney ever had. In some wards, this machine could bring home votes with 90 percent efficiency, a fact revealed in the election of 1934 when Maybank candidates handily defeated the incumbent state senator and solicitor. At the peak of his power in 1938, Maybank carried Charleston County with 90.9 percent of the vote, becoming the first Charlestonian to win popular election to the governorship since before the Civil War.[22]

The case of Charleston's role in twentieth century South Carolina politics is an example of how historians can profit from occasionally looking at a problem in microcosm. In Charleston, more clearly than in most places, politics developed around well-organized factions within the Democratic party which presented the voter with a relatively clear choice.

As such, the issues which V.O Key wrote were "latent in the economy of South Carolina" were sometimes clearly presented despite the race question.[23] There is a definite need in South Carolina for more such local studies to broaden our understanding of this troubled period in the history of the state.

---

[1] Charleston Evening Post, September 5, 1924, p. 6.

[2] Frank E. Jordan, Jr., The Primary State (Columbia: R.L. Bryan Company, 1968), p. 98.

[3] Doyle W. Boggs, "John Patrick Grace and the Politics of Reform in South Carolina" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1977), pp. 211-215.

[4] John J. Duffy, "Charleston Politics in the Progressive Era" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1963), p. 31.

[5] Francis B. Simkins, Pitchfork Ben Tillman (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967), pp. 240-259.

[6] Robert Milton Burts, Richard Irvine Manning and the Progressive Movement in South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974), p. 46.

[7] Thomas R. Waring to William Watts Ball, November 15, 1911, William Watts Ball Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

[8] The description found below of the organization and practices of the Charleston machines is condensed from Boggs, "John Patrick Grace," pp. 31-39.

[9] U.S. Congress, House, To Dismiss Charges Filed Against Richard Whaley, H. Rept. 168, 63rd Congress, 2d session, 1913.

[10] Thomas R. Waring, Jr., "Self Defense from Ambush," in Charleston Murders (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1947).

[11] Evening Post, August 21, 1911, p.2

[12] Duffy, "Charleston Politics in the Progressive Era," p. 317.

[13] The Charleston liquor controversy has been fully discussed in Duffy, "Charleston Politics in the Progressive Era," Burts, Richard I. Manning, and Alan Coleman, "The Charleston Bootlegging Controversy," South Carolina Historical Magazine LXXV (April 1974), 82. However, none of these accounts link local politics to the liquor controversy, and I do not believe the connection should be overlooked. For a thorough account see Boggs, "John Patrick Grace," pp. 85-101.

[14] Thomas R. Waring to William Watts Ball, August 4, 1919, Ball papers.

[15] Jordan, The Primary State, pp. 35, 98.

[16] William Watts Ball to Thomas F. McDow, August 30, 1922, Ball papers; Ball to Samuel L. Adams, September 18, 1922, Ball papers.

[17] Jordan, The Primary State, p. 35.

[18] Charleston News and Courier, June 16, 1923, p. 12.

[19] Boggs, "John Patrick Grace," pp. 223-224.

[20] Ibid., pp. 236-242.

[21] News and Courier, May 10, 1931, p. 4A.

[22] A complete discussion of the Maybank administration may be found in Marvin Lee Cann, "Burnett Rhett Maybank and the New Deal in South Carolina, 1931-1941" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967).

[23] V.O. Key, Jr., Southern Politics in the State and Nation (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), p. 131.

SLAVE OR SUPER-SLAVE: WHO REALLY DID LABOR IN THE SOUTHERN COTTON FIELDS?

William F. Steirer, Jr.

The search for who really did labor in the Southern cotton fields has led historians like Herbert Aptheker, Earle Thorpe, Vincent Harding, Sterling Stuckey, Albert Murry, Mike Thelwell, and the pair of Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman to create a new historical figure. This figure "super-slave," is identifiable by his ability to dominate any and all situations independent of adversity. The concept of "super-slave" is very real in the minds of these scholars, for they have interpreted the Nineteenth Century slave experience much differently than did the abolitionists, or U.B. Phillips, or Stanley Elkins.

In this view, slaves, although deprived of freedom, constantly and effectively resisted in a variety of ways, becoming in the process of resisting, "super-slaves" capable of transforming the very structure of slavery itself. Slaves did not need, in fact, rejected, the culture of the master, substituting for it a culture superior in all respects, strong, independent, self-sustaining, both reinforcing and being reinforced by the "super-slaves." Such figures were "greater than life," men possessing such talents, emotional resiliency, and love of freedom that they far outstripped ordinary men--whites and their unfortunately less endowed brothers and sisters.

This concept of "super-slave" became in the 1960's and early 1970's the radical chic/black militant replacement for the "Sambo" stereotype--a stereotyped replacement that is equally as insidious and anti-historical as was the image of "Sambo." Instead of being "the perpetual child incapable of maturity," who labored in the fields with the benevolent tolerance of the master, the "super-slave" apparently honored the master by working for him at all. Unhappily, in the confrontation between the two stereotypes, opportunities to catch a glimpse of the real human beings who were slaves become rare and fleeting.

Just such a glimpse was provided by Kenneth Stampp in 1956 in his booklength challenge to "Sambo," The Peculiar Institution. Stampp said in a much criticized (unfairly, in my opinion) statement that "the slaves were merely ordinary human beings, that innately Negroes are, after all, only white men with black skins, nothing more, nothing less ...it gives their story a relevance to men of all races which it never seemed to have before."[1] It is usually forgotten that Stampp was striving to certify something that slave-holders, abolitionists, and scholars (like Phillips) have refused to certify--that slaves were like other human beings possessing emotions, intelligence, sensibilities, sensitivities, talents, virtues, and vices in the same variable and highly differentiated ways.

Whatever racial implications Stampp intended by describing Negroes as "white men with black skins," in cultural terms he advanced the plausible thesis that what culture was available to slaves was necessarily modelled after the only culture at all familiar to them, the white man's. That culture was, Stampp argues (as does Genovese), a culture that bore visible marks of the slave presence although even if this had not been true "their (blacks and whites) striking similarities as human beings" would have wiped out all cultural differences after "a generation or two."[2] Indeed the slave was "the embodiment of the South's peculiar institution" which in turn formed the keystone of the region's culture.[3]

Stampp further emphasized that slaves and masters shared such human characteristics as "a desire to distinguish between moral and immoral, good and evil, right and wrong ... /and/ the resilience and adaptability of rational, educable creatures who depended upon their brains rather than their instincts for survival."[4] In addition, Stampp observed that

> One fact is established beyond any reasonable doubt. This is the fact that variations in the capacities and personalities of individuals within each race are as great as the variations in their physical traits. Therefore, it is impossible to make valid generalizations about races as such.[5]

Stampp implies that ordinary people differ in ordinary ways but in extraordinary ways, too.

Three years later, Stanley Elkins pushed the "Sambo" stereotype to its ultimate limit, and it has been his interpretation of slaves as "other-than-ordinary" that has ignited the reaction that ended with "super-slave." Only Eugene D. Genovese, William Styron, Christopher Lasch, and George Frederickson have made serious efforts to rebut Elkins on the grounds that he was not talking about real people. Their words were buried under the avalanche of righteous words written by Aptheker, Harding, Stuckey, and others dedicated to erasing "Sambo," once and for all. They chose to accomplish that task by creating the chic image of "super-slave" already mentioned. In this way they would not only rid themselves of "Sambo," but turn being a slave into a positive experience for millions of American blacks - an experience which could be viewed, if not exactly with fondness by those millions, at least as an example of the type of behavior expected of their progeny.

"Super-slave" is a silly term, but there is none better suited to describe this particular historical role claimed for slaves. In this role, slaves, individually and collectively, are placed at the center of the system from which point they seek out the limits to man's capacities and continually expand the possibilities within their environment. And those possibilities seem to extend to the point where Mike Thelwell, describing <u>every</u> slave as a "hero ...constantly resisting and rebelling,"[6] apparently agrees with Aptheker's statement that "all manifestations of human capacities and feelings were forms of resistance. Demonstrations of tenderness and rage, of love and hate, of scorn and pity, of pride and shame, of honor and artistry, were expressions of resistance to dehumanization and therefore to enslavement."[7] Constant resistance becomes the life style of slaves motivated by a love of freedom that burns so deeply and so intensely in the souls of slaves that nothing was capable of snuffing it out--or so the purveyors of the notion of "super-slave" explain it.

But it was necessary to claim that all slaves are "super-slaves" for the concept to be a viable one. Too many demonstrably provable examples of slaves performing at another level than "super" exist to defend such universal inclusion. Sterling Stuckey more "realistically" concedes that the "grim system of American slavery doubtless broke the spirits of uncounted numbers of slaves." Yet, Stuckey does not lose sight of "super-slave," observing that

> nevertheless ...we can see others transcending their plight, appreciating the tragic irony of their condition, then seizing upon and putting to use those aspects of their experience which sustain in the present and renew in the future ... /see this/ affirms the existence of a large number of vital, tough-minded human beings who, though severely limited and abused by slavery, had found a way both to endure and preserve their humanity in the face of insuperable odds.[8]

Stuckey and the other "romantics" attribute enough "savvy" and talent to these "super-slaves" (these "vital, tough-minded men") that the "insuperable odds" become more manageable in their hands. Urged on by their inward desire for freedom, the "super-slaves" prove to be active agents of change in minimizing the brutalities, oppressiveness, and dehumanizing tendencies of the peculiar institution. Much of this they accomplished by gradually developing a culture that supports the collective body while protecting and nurturing the individual slaves.

The saga of "super-slave" began when according to historical proponents the precious seeds of an independent, self-sustaining, and viable culture were planted by a handful of individuals who had survived the rigors of enslavement relatively unscathed. In the beginning they built their culture upon a base of folklore including heroes like the mythical John, "a secular high priest of mischief and guile." Like other slave folk figures he suffered from no inferiority complex and "it is important to note that his varieties of triumphs ..., often realistically cluster about ways of coping with everyday negatives of the system."[9]

Later they and others like them combined African and indigenous elements into a musical form that became the most valid expression of slave values in daily life, the cornerstone of the slave culture. When in the middle of the Eighteenth Century this music was joined to a religious impulse, more and more slaves were able to endure and to preserve their humanity, to find the "elbow room" that existed on every plantation, and to exploit their talents fully, if not in the tasks assigned by the master, in the encouraging of strong and stable family relationships. In the slave quarters monogamous man-woman ties prevailed, responsibilities such as provisioning and disciplining children were assumed, and slave children were reared and cared for by the parents until all the significant values could be absorbed, all aimed not only at coping with slavery but with overcoming it.[10] Harding and Blassingame insist in this context that a "super-slave" like Nat Turner learned the values of freedom and of resistance to oppression within the structure of a militant, heroic family.[11]

By 1800, then, "super-slave" could be said to have arrived in an historical sense. Thereafter led by the "super-slaves," slaves gained visible results through organized strikes, slowdowns, violence, and non-cooperation.[12] Slaves, all slaves, could be whatever they wished to be, according to Earle Thorpe, for the "super-slaves" had opened up such opportunities for everyone, especially themselves, that both the spirit and the form of slavery were changed. Because of their efforts the necessities of life were now plentiful; the prevailing social and legal codes protected the slaves; slaves assumed responsibilities previously unavailable to them; and slaves came increasingly to resemble free men living in a social system where harmony reigned. The "romantic" historians have strayed so far in this direction that it is possible to read some of their works, by Thorpe, for example, and wonder why anyone ever complained about slavery.[13] The credit for the improved circumstances is given to the "super-slaves" who by their initiative, creativity, courage, perserverance, and love for freedom made it all possible.

Within the past five years a new mutated form of "super-slave" has shown up in the pages of a controversial book, Time on the Cross. Fogel and Engerman agree that the historians who make a claim for the presence of "super-slave" have sought to escape the Elkins' idea of sociological inferiority by arguing that "blacks were stronger than the repression," but insist that

> the most that proponents of this view were able to conjure up were a handful of abortive

> conspiracies and ineffectual attempts at 'day-to-day resistance.' Thus blacks were made to be failures even at resistance--sympathetic failures, but failures nevertheless. The image of black incompetence was unintentionally extended to still another dimension of life.[14]

Fogel and Engerman are badly mistaken and unfair because they refuse to recognize that cultural factors can reverse that "image of black incompetence" as readily as economic factors, and because they fail to perceive that in reversing the "image of black incompetence" they have developed their own image of "super-slave." Thus, Fogel and Engerman have written an entire book dedicated to the proposition of publicizing "super-slave." True, as observed earlier it is a mutant form, but it is identifiable as "super-slave." The unique part of their presentation lies in their assertion that slave labor, instead of being withheld or negotiated, is the most efficient and most productive form of labor in the United States. Precisely because of the ability of the slaves to demonstrate this economic fact, the institution of slavery gradually came under the effective control of the workers, themselves, particularly those "super-slaves."

On pages 209-210, Fogel and Engerman in noting that large slave plantations were 34% more efficient than free southern farms (whatever that means), the pair say that

> this advantage was not due to some special way in which land or machinery was used, but to the special quality of plantation labor ... the superior quality of black labor. In a certain sense, all or nearly all of the advantage is attributable to the high quality of slave labor.

The high quality was largely due to the efforts of the slaves who constituted the first group of laborers in America to be trained to assembly-line work rhythms who accommodated themselves to these patterns;[15] who operated within the framework of a high degree of specialization;[16] who cooperated with each other and coordinated their efforts without competitive interferences intruding;[17] and who developed a basic work ethic that depended less on rewards and punishments than on internalized feelings of self-satisfaction.[18] The mass of slaves was led by drivers and other skilled leaders who both by example and exhortation persuaded those masses of the need for working in an efficient manner.[19] Together they reached heights of productivity that, Fogel and Engerman proclaim, were unknown anywhere else in America, either in agricultural or industrial pursutis.

Fogel and Engerman's "super-slaves" even altered the patterns of family living as a consequence of their economic successes. They achieved a level of efficiency and productivity that encouraged the master to leave families alone to control their own affairs and activities. By their own self-initiated efforts they were able to change and transform the institution of slavery from within. Like Thorpe a decade earlier, the pair unconsciously and unwittingly made slavery an institution containing so much "elbow room" that it is possible to wonder why anyone would regard slavery as a "Time on the Cross," if indeed the "Time on the Cross" was any worse than time spent by non-slaves. (Fogel and Engerman do seem to realize rather off-handedly that their arguments open up the prospect that slavery was not so bad, and that the real "Time on the Cross" occurred following emancipation, not before.)[20]

In portraying the men who functioned as slaves as donning mantles of heroic proportions but lacking in depth, vices, doubts, and all semblances of the complexities and ambivalences usually associated with homo sapiens, the historians mentioned have provided us with an incomplete portrait. It would appear that in trying so hard to shape the slaves into heroes, they failed first to shape them into flesh and blood human beings.

Obviously sharing these same suspicions, Genovese observes that

> If their [slaves] actions were less bombastic and heroic than romantic historians would like us to believe, they were nonetheless impressive in their assertion of resourcefulness, dignity, and a strong sense of self and community.[21]

Along these lines, Genovese argues that rather than being one dimensional heroes, slaves manifested their humanity by the complexity of their personalities. He defends Styron against critics appalled at Styron's describing Nat Turner as a man possessed not only with qualities of resourcefulness and courage, but a man filled with doubts and fears, and wracked by inner conflicts and pains.[22] Functioning as a human being is never simple and it surely was not for Nat Turner or for any slave. Certainly the slave who adroitly outwitted his master in the way his master hoped he would, proves his cleverness in Genovese's opinion, but not his manhood.[23]

> The history of every people exhibits glory and shame, heroism and cowardice, wisdom and foolishness, certainty and doubt, and more often than not these antagonistic qualities appear at the same moment and in the same man.[24]

Here indeed is the story of humanity.

How many of these "antagonistic qualities" are present in any individual or group of individuals depends upon the unique combination of personality traits with external circumstances. Neither side of the combination should dominate historians' thinking about slavery any longer. With the publication of studies like John Blassingame's on the slave community, it is no longer defensible to generalize about slavery in so sweeping a manner as to emphasize any single aspect of slavery as prevailing at all times and in all places. The range of situations in which slaves found themselves stretches from Simon Gray, the almost legendary riverboat captain, to a field hand on the plantation of William S. Pettigrew in Tyrell County, North Carolina, and includes all the way points in between. Gray carried the responsiblility for the good name of his master, large sums of money, the conduct of a business, and a mobile life style while Pettigrew's hand, Caesar, lacked being responsible for even his own labor. Where Gray lived with his family away from his master, quietly and without interference, Caesar lived in slave cabins in the shadow of the master, literally and figuratively. It seems pointless, therefore, to describe slaves whether as "super-slaves" or "Sambos." The need is to develop an explanatory scheme that will account not only for the Grays and the Caesars, but all other slaves as well.

Genovese has supplied much of that explanatory scheme in his full length study, Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made by insisting that slaves possessed an historically viable and active freedom to act and think in diverse and unique ways like other men. By ignoring the notion of "super-slave," Genovese has stressed the point that slaves, like other men, could disagree or conform, could be heroes or villains, could be right or wrong, and could be predictable or unpredictable depending upon the who, what, where, why and how of the situation. In other words, they were men free to assume responsibilities or reject them, free to develop workable standards or to accept other men's standards, and free to be "slaves" or not.

In this vein let me conclude by briefly describing several examples. Later in his life, Josiah Henson would escape from slavery, but in his early twenties he led a gang of slaves from his master's plantation in Kentucky through Ohio to another Kentucky plantation. Throughout the journey he was deaf to the pleas, threats, and curses of his fellow slaves and delivered them safely and still in bondage. The interesting thing is not that he performed his mission for his master, for Elkins could explain that easily enough as evidence of the dehumanizing process where all sensitivity is lost and blind obedience remains; but that Henson's master trusted Henson to do his job like any other faithful employee. The master never doubted that those slaves would reach their destination regardless of temptation and he was correct. He, Henson, was a man doing a job and his main satisfaction was to do it well, not to free slaves.

The normal range of human behavior is visible for slaves during the period of Nat Turner's rebellion. While some slaves opted to follow Turner, others chose to line up with the "white folk" for reasons as understandable as those of the rebels, some even fighting against Turner's ragged army. Two slave women, in another instance, fought over the fate of their mistress, Mrs. John T. Baron, with the winner saving Mrs. Baron's life. Turner, himself, was turned in by two slaves who spurned his requests to keep him hidden.[25] Their decisions must be judged in the context of first, the possibility and, then, the actuality of the retributive violence being meted out by the whites, and arose partly out of fear, partly out of a desire to be rewarded for "good behavior," partly out of a desire to end the blood being shed among blacks, and partly out of conviction that Turner's actions were wrong! There is no indication by Turner that he expected more support from his people than what he received, for he knew them well.

Turner need only look at himself for confirmation of the ambivalency with which slaves acted. It is the way that human beings who are not super-beings usually act and it is the way most slaves acted--uncertainly, hesitantly, only rarely committing themselves fully to the attaining of an objective. Frederick Douglass is another who perceived this. No trace of rancor, frustration, or anger creeps into his description of how a fellow slave, Sandy Jenkins, betrayed his first escape try; he could accept that Jenkins had a faith in the system and a wish to maintain a proper life on the plantation that Douglass's escape would imperil. What else is new, seems to be his attitude.[26]

On another occasion, Douglass observed wryly that the Christmas holiday celebrations were functionally important to the whites by providing a safety-valve for slave emotions and a means of further downgrading blacks. No rational behavior was permitted and everyone was told what behavior was sanctioned--drunkenness, dancing, sex, gambling, and "wild and low sports." Douglass acknowledged that he went along with this arrangement, willingly, even eagerly. Why not? Should not men who have worked hard, play hard as well in spite of any nefarious purposes underlying the entertainment?[27] Ordinary human beings would answer yes, but "super-slaves" could only answer no and resist the pressures.

"To make a contented slave, you must make a thoughtless one," commented Douglass,[28] without apparently realizing that most men are thoughtless most of the time. There is no more blame to be attached to a contented slave than to a contented free man. What, one may ask, is wrong with being contented anyhow? The implicit assumption that if you are not contented with your lot in this world, your discontent will translate into resistance is patently absurd. Too much has happened in the 20th century for this to be credited, but it is an important facet of the belief in "super-slave."

Nonetheless, one of the fascinating aspects of Douglass's autobiography, to me, is his unwillingness to issue perjorative judgments about other slaves. Slavery he denounced, slaves he empathized with, had compassion for, understood. He knew what it was to be broken, for like many slaves it had happened to him. He had remained relatively "content" through the years of his adolescence within a simple behavioral system in spite of the untypical opportunities afforded him at different times. This would change after he was hired out to Edward Covey, a notorious slave breaker. In Douglass's case the end of contentment did produce resistance, but surely the opposite result happened as frequently.

Under Covey, Douglass, who had never been abused, was subjected to a campaign that shattered his will.

> Mr. Covey succeeded in breaking me--in body, soul, and spirit ...the dark night of slavery closed in upon me, and behold a man transformed into a brute.[29]

But the very terror inherent in the capricious and unpredictable manner Covey treated him, released him from the standards that had earlier bound him. Douglass recalls that

> my religious views on the subject of resisting my master had suffered a serious shock by the savage persecution to which I had been subjected, and my hands were no longer tied by my religion.[30]

So by the time Covey again tried to flog him, Douglass had decided to gamble and to fight back. He had to that extent become free, for "when a slave cannot be flogged, he is more than half free."[31] But the Frederick Douglass who rose up and would not be flogged was no more a "super-slave" than were Nat Turner, Josiah Henson, William Wells Brown, Henry Bibb, Solomon Northrup, J.C. Pennington, George Ball, the thousands of slaves recorded in the slave narratives, and the millions of forgotten slaves. "White men with black skins," Kenneth Stampp calls them and in the sense that he means that they do not differ from ordinary white men beyond the reach of slavery I would agree.[32]

Who really did labor in the southern cotton fields? The answer has always been available to historians--men and women like them, some talented, some not; some brave, some not; some intelligent, some not; some loving, some not; some industrious, some not; some likeable, some not--people who carried the full load of human woes and joys. The challenge is greater than the problem of discovering who labored in Southern cotton fields, but who labored in all fields at all times.

---

[1] Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution; Slavery in the AnteBellum South (New York: 1956), pp. vii-viii.

[2] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[3] Ibid., p. 14.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 10.

[6] Mike Thelwell, "Back with the Wind: Mr. Styron and the Reverend Turner," originally from William Styron's Nat Turner: Ten Black Writers Respond (Boston: 1968), pp. 79-91, found in the Nat Turner Rebellion, ed. by John B. Duff and Peter M. Mitchell (New York: 1971), p. 187.

[7] Herbert Aptheker, "Slave Resistance in the United States," found in Key Issues in the Afro-American Experience, vol. 1, ed. by Nathan I. Huggins, Martin Kilson, and Daniel M. Fox (New York: 1971), p. 163.

[8] Sterling Stuckey, "Through the Prism of Folklore: The Black Ethos in Slavery," found in The Debate over Slavery: Stanley Elkins and His Critics, ed. by Ann J. Lane (Urbana: 1971), pp. 267-68.

[9] Ibid., pp. 264-65; see also Mina Davis Cauldfield, "Slavery and the Origins of Black Culture: Elkins Revisitid," in Slavery and its Aftermath, vol. 1 of Americans From Africa, ed. by Peter I. Rose (New York: 1970); Thelwell, "Back With the Wind;" and Vincent Harding, "Religion and Resistance Among Antebellum Negroes, 1800-1860," in The Origins of Black America

vol. 1 of *The Making of Black America*, ed. by August Meier and Elliott Rudwick (New York: 1969).

[10] Stuckey, "Twilight of Our Past: Reflections on the Origins of Black History," found in *Amistad 2*, ed. by John A. Williams and Charles F. Harris (New York: 1971), pp. 270-71; Harding, "Religion and Resistance;" Stuckey, "Through the Prism;" Cauldfield, "Slavery and Origins," pp. 178-80; John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Ante-Bellum South* (New York: 1972); George P. Rawick, *From Sundown to Sunup: The Making of the Black Community*, vol. 1, (Westport, Conn.: 1972).

[11] Harding, "An Exchange on 'Nat Turner,' " originally from *New York Review of Books* (November 7, 1968), pp. 35-37, found in *The Turner Rebellion*, Duff and Mitchell.

[12] S. Sydney Bradford, "The Negro Iron-Worker in Ante-Bellum Virginia," originally from *Journal of Southern History*, xxv (May, 1959), pp. 194-206.

[13] Earle E. Thorpe, "Chattel Slavery and Concentration Camps," originally from *Negro History Bulletin*, 25, (May, 1962), found in *Americans From Africa*, vol. 1, pp. 157-59.

[14] Robert W. Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: 1974), p. 259.

[15] *Ibid*., p. 208.

[16] *Ibid*., pp. 205-07.

[17] *Ibid*., p. 205.

[18] *Ibid*., pp. 230-32, 144-47.

[19] *Ibid*., pp. 212-15.

[20] *Ibid*., pp. 260-64.

[21] Eugene D. Genovese, "American Slaves and Their History," originally from *New York Review of Books* (December 3, 1970), pp. 34-43, found in *In Red and Black* (New York: 1972), p. 127.

[22] Genovese, "The Nat Turner Case," originally from New York Review of Books (September 12, 1968), pp. 34-37, found in The Turner Rebellion, pp. 206-07, 210.

[23] Genovese, "Rebelliousness and Docility In the Negro Slave: A Critique of the Elkins Thesis," originally from Civil War History, xiii, (December, 1967), pp. 293-314, found in The Black Americans: Interpretative Readings, ed. by Seth M. Scheiner and Tilden G. Edelstein (New York: 1971), p. 98.

[24] Genovese, "Turner Case," p. 216.

[25] Nat Turner, "The Confessions of Nat Turner," in Herbert Aptheker, Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion (New York: 1968), pp. 146-49, 57-64.

[26] Frederick Douglass, Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, Collier Books Edition (New York: 1962), pp. 171-72.

[27] Ibid., pp. 146-48.

[28] Ibid., p. 186.

[29] Ibid., p. 139.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid., p. 143.

[32] Stampp, Peculiar Institution, pp. vii-viii.

THE LOW COUNTRIES AND THE QUEST FOR A NEGOTIATED PEACE, 1939-1940

Birdsall S. Viault

The outbreak of war in September 1939 came as a profound shock to the European neutrals, especially to the Low Countries which stood in a particularly precarious position between the two warring camps. The Hague and Brussels were convinced that if the war continued for more than a few months, it would be virtually impossible for them to avoid becoming embroiled in it. They thus sought opportunities to mediate between the belligerents, although these opportunities proved to be few and their efforts fruitless.

During World War I, the Netherlands had remained neutral and hoped to do the same in the new conflict.[1] Belgium had been devastated during the First World War and, following that struggle, had bound herself to France by a defensive alliance. In October 1936, following Germany's rearmament and the reoccupation of the Rhineland, Belgium withdrew from this alliance and returned to a policy of neutrality. The Belgians must have felt reassured in their position when Great Britain and France offered new pledges of aid in the event of attack. These pledges were entirely unilateral and cost Belgium nothing. Just prior to the outbreak of war, London and Paris renewed their guarantees, and Hitler, who for the time being desired the neutrality of the Low Countries, promised that Germany would never threaten their integrity.[2]

On September 7, German Ambassador Vicco von Bülow-Schwante reported to Berlin on the mood of the Belgian people. Their memories of the First World War were strong, he noted, and their sympathies were predominantly on the side of the Allies. In their policy of neutrality, the Belgians were sincere, Bülow believed. Despite their aversion to Nazi Germany, they wished to live in peace and would resist any pressure from Britain and France. Bülow warned that this might change, however, if Allied propaganda efforts became more intense and if the Allies scored military gains in the West.[3]

In the wake of the German defeat of Poland, hopes for a negotiated peace were expressed in many quarters, and the Low Countries were no exception. Belgian Ambassador Jacques Davignon returned to Berlin from Brussels and conferred, on October 2, with State Secretary Ernst von Weizsäcker. Apparently on the basis of official information, as Weizsäcker concluded, Davignon reported that while the British remained obstinate, the French cabinet contained a number of "pronounced friends of peace." The French, however, were dominated by London. The only thing that could impress the British, Davignon maintained, was what Washington said. And in Washington, only Mussolini could make himself heard. If there was to be any real hope for peace, the ambassador insisted, it could come only through the diplomatic channel Rome-Washington-London. Discretion was essential, Davignon argued, and any public appeal should be preceded by sufficient diplomatic preparation.[4] Berlin displayed no inclination to pursue the ambassador's recommendations.

On October 6, Hitler advanced some vague proposals for peace in an address to the Reichstag. In essence, the Führer demanded Allied recognition of his conquests and offered the prospect of a conference to discuss disarmament and security issues, without outlining any specific proposals.[5] All in all, it scarcely constituted a serious peace offer and it was quickly rebuffed by London and Paris.

Following Hitler's address, American Ambassador Joseph E. Davies in Brussels informed Washington that a "high official"--later revealed to have been King Leopold himself-- had requested him to state that only President Roosevelt could prevent a German assault on western Europe. Belgium hoped the President would issue another appeal like those he had made during previous crises. The Belgians, Davies reported, were clinging "desperately to the hope that time and development of some possibly unforeseen events might avert the catastrope before it is hardened with finality."[6]

President Roosevelt gave "real study" to Leopold's request and told Davies that he would "continue to watch the situation day by day." But, the President added, the United States could act as a mediator only "after it has become abundantly clear that the path towards which we may point does in fact lie in the direction of peace." As things stood, Roosevelt did not believe any opportunity existed for a successful American initiative.[7]

Although the Belgians and Dutch could not expect an American initiative, they sought through other channels to secure peace. As early as October 1, Dr. Phillips C. Visser, the Dutch minister in Ankara, told Franz von Papen, the German ambassador to Turkey, that the Netherlands was prepared to mediate in the event an official request were advanced. Queen Wilhelmina, he stated, would act jointly with King Leopold of Belgium. Visser requested Papen to inform Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop that "'it was psychologically of the greatest importance to make a peace offer through a third party'" and that "'the Führer ought to avoid for the time being a declaration, having the character of finality, in the Reichstag.'" Visser assured Papen that he would never have received such an instruction from The Hague if soundings had not first been made to see if Britain was prepared to negotiate. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that such soundings had in fact been made.

Visser was in contact with the British ambassador to Turkey, Sir Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, who appeared to go beyond the position of his government. On October 3, Visser told Papen of his conversations with the British ambassador concerning the Dutch readiness to mediate Knatchbull-Hugessen had explained that, since British public opinion would regard any peace offers publicly advanced by Germany as a demand for capitulation and would reject them, only confidential diplomatic contacts through a third party could have any hope of success. For tactical reasons, the first offer should be phrased in general terms, so that concessions which Germany was prepared to make could be used psychologically to influence public opinion.[8]

Papen was deeply interested in this effort to secure peace. Although he had helped ease Hitler's way into power, he had now soured on National Socialism and distrusted Hitler's foreign policy. In his conversations with Visser, Papen suggested that a basis for peace negotiations should include the establishment of an independent Poland, with the cession to Germany of its western provinces, and the restoration of Chechoslovakia within the frontiers agreed to at Munich. The Germans should also guarantee the security of the Balkans and eastern Mediterranean. Papen stressed the importance of the restoration of confidence in the German signature, which had been destroyed by Hitler's foreign policy.[9] Informed of Papen's remarks, Ambassador Knatchbull-Hugessen observed: "Brought to a fine point ...these proposals involved the removal of Hitler and the installation of a less violent regime."[10] The fact that this was unlikely to happen underlines the improbability of achieving a negotiated peace settlement which would satisfy all concerned.

Nevertheless, in an attempt to forward the cause of peace, Papen returned to Berlin on October 18 and conferred with Hitler, who remained non-committal. Ribbentrop, however, was furious and told Papen: " 'The Führer does not want to hear anything of peace negotiations; please do not undertake any further steps.' " The Foreign Minister also forbade members of his ministry "to receive Ambassador von Papen ...or to enter into offical conversations with him." When Papen complained of this order to Hitler, the Führer explained that Ribbentrop was extremely nervous and that Papen sould not take the order seriously. Hitler, however, rejected the ambassador's peace proposals. And Papen discovered that Ribbentrop's order was being obeyed, since he could not secure an appointment with any Wilhelmstrasse official.[11]

Papen persisted in his efforts, and in December he forwarded to Berlin a detailed report on possible preconditions for peace. Furthermore, he secured permission for Kurt Freiherr von Lersner, who had headed the German delegation at Versailles in 1919, to go to Istanbul. Papen and Lersner worked, without success, to advance peace efforts, and the ambassador had no choice but to pursue his main mission, seeking to prevent Turkish intervention on the Allied side.[12]

Although the Papen-Visser talks came to naught, the Dutch continued to work in other areas. After October 6, The Hague sought to conform its peace efforts with the terms of Hitler's speech. Foreign Minister Eelco van Kleffens thought the speech's major defect lay in its indication of "an intention on the part of the Germans to gain effective and exclusive domination over all the peoples of Central Europe." Nevertheless, he believed that Hitler's exact terms should be ascertained, since he was convinced of the Germans' readiness to negotiate.[13]

On October 7, van Kleffens conferred with Count Julius von Zech, the German minister at the Hague. The British, van Kleffens observed, seemed to be leaving the door open to a peaceful settlement. What was important now, he maintained, was to ease the way for a possible shift in the position of the Chamberlain government by conditioning British public opinion. The best way to alter British opinion, the Foreign Minister suggested, was to push the disarmament issue to the fore by making as many detailed proposals as possible. This would help dispel suspicions concerning Germany's ultimate objectives. If an adroit mediator went to London with disarmament proposals, British opinion would be powerfully impressed. In any event, van Kleffens argued, it was of crucial importance to do something as soon as possible.[14] Van Kleffens also told Professor Viktor Bruns, the director of the Institute of Public Law of Foreign Countries and International Law at the University of Berlin, that the Dutch government would at any time be willing to cooperate in the initiation of negotiations.[15]

Van Kleffens' conversations had been held during the period between Hitler's October 6 speech and the Anglo-French rejection of the Führer's vague overture several days later. Rumors of German military preparations along the Belgian and Dutch borders now became more frequent, and during the final days of October and the first days of November, both The Hague and Brussels learned, from authoritative sources at the highest levels of the German counter-intelligence service, that the German offensive in the West would soon begin.[16]

Concerned about the threat of a German invasion, van Kleffens proposed to Queen Wilhelmina on November 5 that she renew to the belligerents the offer of good offices which she had first made in August. The Queen agreed, and arrangements were made to enlist the cooperation of King Leopold. The Belgian King was convinced, despite all warnings, that the Germans would not attempt a large scale attack because of the lateness of the season. But Leopold accepted Wilhelmina's invitation in the hope that their efforts might provide the belligerents with the means of discussing peace. On the evening of November 6, Leopold went to the Hague, accompanied by Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak. Conversations between the two monarchs and their foreign ministers resulted in the draft of an offer of good offices, which was discussed further on the following morning. Spaak had no faith in the move, believing that "it would be useless, even dangerous." But King Leopold thought differently and, on the afternoon of November 7, the note was dispatched to King George VI, President Albert Lebrun of France, and Hitler.[17]

Noting that the belligerents had "declared that they were not averse to examining honest and secure bases for a just peace," Wilhelmina and Leopold declared: "It is our impression that they find it difficult in the present circumstances to establish contact for a more complete exposition and coordination of their position." The two monarchs were, consequently, "willing to place ourselves at their disposal as they may see fit and, with all resources at our command and in the spirit of friendly sympathy, facilitate the transmission of proposals for the attainment of an understanding."[18]

A few days of anxious wating followed. The Hague continued to receive warnings about Germany's military intentions,[19] as did Brussels. On November 8, Foreign Minister Spaak told American Ambassador Davies that he did not believe there was even "a 50-50 chance" of avoiding war. Rather than trying to do useless things, Spaak said, Belgium should try to "preserve its own trusts and exert some control over the partisan pro-ally attitude of the Belgian press." Apparently, Spaak's last hope for peace lay in the strict observance of neutrality. From his conversations in Brussels, Davies concluded that "Germany is pressing the neutrals to assume active responsibility in pushing a peace offensive if they wish to prevent the horrors of the unrestricted war that otherwise is impending. Because Germany's action is unpredictable Belgium is taking every precaution."[20]

On November 11, Spaak met with the German ambassador in an attempt to clarify the situation. He gave Bülow the impression of being very depressed, asking immediately why Germany was concentrating troops against Belgium, which had been scrupulously neutral. The German troop movements, Bülow replied, were provoked by French activity on the southern border of Belgium. Rejecting this explanation, Spaak remarked that Bülow knew as well as he did that the French had no intention of invading Belgium. In his report to Berlin, Bülow warned that grave concern about a German attack was felt in Belgium and that military preparations were being conducted with "feverish haste."[21] Bülow had earlier incorrectly reported that information from a reliable source indicated that the initiative for the offer of good offices had come from King Leopold, who had exact information about the formation of German units.[22]

As reports of impending attack continued to be heard, Dutch preparations also increased. On November 11, The Hague received positive reports that the Germans would attack the following morning at dawn. During the afternoon, however, messages began to arrive, indicating a change in the German plans. Then at 5:30 p.m., the German minister appeared at the Foreign Ministry with a message from Berlin.[23] "The Führer has received the telegram sent to him by Queen Wilhelmina and King Leopold jointly," the note stated. "The contents of the telegram will be carefully studied." Bülow delivered a similar note in Brussels.[24]

The German note broke the tension. If the attack had not been cancelled, it had at least been postponed. From this time forward, in fact, Hitler deferred the date of the attack on twenty-nine occasions. Although the continued uncertainty of the weather played a role in the postponements, so too, did the recalcitrance of Hitler's generals. And, in particular, the Führer's November 11 decision may also have been influenced by his knowledge that The Hague and Brussels had obtained information about Germany's plans, convincing him that the element of surprise had been lost.

The Dutch-Belgian mediation offer displeased the British and French as much as it did the Germans. In London, King George VI declared flatly that no peace could be made with Hitler, "as the old reason for our being at war with him still holds good."[25] Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain was privately "much disgusted" by the offer. He dismissed it as "a manoeuvre to prevent Hitler's attacking the Low Countries."[26] While he intended to give the appeal official consideration, so it would not appear that he had rejected it "off hand," he intended to reject it. Chamberlain was certain that no peace proposals were practical at this point, since the German people had not "suffered enough ...to be disgusted with the leadership." When American Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy asked Chamberlain how long he expected the war to last, the Prime Minister replied: " 'I do not believe it will go beyond the spring.' " He was certain that Hitler would collapse because of the absence of victories and the continued pressure of the Allied blockade.[27]

In Paris, the Quai d'Orsay entertained several opinions about the real nature of the mediation proposal. In addition to the more obvious interpretations, there was also the gloomy hypothesis that Queen Wilhelmina had decided to permit the Germans to occupy the Netherlands but believed she must have an excuse in order not to shock her people and world opinion too profoundly. Such an excuse might be provided by an Anglo-French rejection of the proposal. A Foreign Ministry official told American Ambassador William C. Bullitt that neither Wilhelmina nor Leopold could in reality have the slightest hope that their appeal would be successful. After all, he explained, Paris and London had made it clear that they were determined to fight until Poland and Czechoslavakia had been restored. The official found it astounding that King Leopold, "the independence of whose country existed only because France and England had refused to make peace as long as German troops were on Belgian soil," should now seek to obtain "a precarious and momentary safety for his country."[28]

On November 12, President Lebrun directed France's reply to Wilhelmina and Leopold. "Only a peace founded on justice is durable," Lebrun wrote. "Any solution which consecrates the triumph of injustice will be only a precarious peace. It is up to Germany and not to France to declare herself for or against a real peace, which is desired by all peoples whose security and independence are threatened."[29]

The reply of King George VI resembled that of Lebrun. The British monarch reminded Wilhelmina and Leopold that Germany's attack on Poland had provided the "immediate occasion leading to our decision to enter the war." Britain had determined to fight in order "to prevent for the future resort to force instead of to pacific means in settlement of international disputes." Nevertheless, the King gave his assurance that London would examine with care any reasonable offer for the establishment of a just and honorable peace.[30]

Berlin had received the monarch's offer with "sarcasm and sneering," the chief of the army's General Staff, Franz Halder, noted, and Otto Dietrich, the press chief, ordered the news media to play it down.[31] When Italian Ambassador Bernardo Attolico sought to discuss the offer with Weizsäcker, the State Secretary declared simply that the British would have nothing to do with it.[32] On November 14, Belgian Ambassador Davignon presented a note from his government to Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop. Even though the French and British responses had been unfavorable, the note stated, the offer of good offices had not lost its purpose, and the two monarchs remained willing to mediate at any point. Ribbentrop was in an unpleasant mood and told Davignon that this attempt at mediation had had the "catastrophic result" that he had expected all along. The British and French replies constituted nothing more than "insolence," of which the German government would take no notice. Berlin now knew, Ribbentrop maintained, the "England had prepared the war long in advance; the evidence discovered in Poland and Czechia gave an incontrovertible picture which confirmed this." Chamberlain's desire for war, the Foreign Minister added, had been further demonstrated in his reply to Hitler's offer of peace in October. A war to the finish was the consequence. Ribbentrop held a similar conversation with the Dutch minister.[33]

Although the Wilhelmstrasse prepared a draft of a formal reply to the Dutch and Belgian proposal, it was never sent. Instead, on November 15, Ribbentrop summoned Ambassador Davignon and van Heersma de With, the Dutch mininster, and informed them of a statement to be released by the official D.N.B. news agency the following day. "Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop," the statement declared, "informed the Belgian and Dutch Representatives, in the name of the Führer, that after the brusque refusal of the peace move of the King of the Belgians and the Queen of the Netherlands by the British and French Governments, the German Government too must consider the matter closed."[34] The response of Ribbentrop was clearly more "brusque" than that of the British and French. The Germans had no interest in mediation, although the Dutch continued to hope that the question might be pursued further at a later date.[35]

A Wilhelmstrasse circular, issued on November 18, explained the attitude of the German government for the guidance of diplomats who had to contend with talk of peace initiatives. On October 6, the Foreign Ministry recalled, Hitler had made a final peace offer to the British and French.

Not only had the Allied reply been purely negative, but it had been made in a manner which was "an insulting and insolent challenge." The British especially had "slammed the door on any attempt whatsoever at peace mediation." The Allies had now manifested the same attitude in their reply to the monarch's offer of mediation. Germany had consequently "taken up the challenge flung at her and would now carry on the fight to final victory."[36]

Having been rebuffed by both the Allies and Germany, the Low Countries refrained from any further public efforts at mediation. However, in Ankara, German Ambassador von Papen had maintained his contact with Dr. Visser, the Dutch minister. For several months, Papen had manifested a non-committal attitude, as Ribbentrop had ordered. But on March 17, Visser informed Papen that, according to information from London, the British appeared to be more favorable to the idea of peace than they had been in the autumn. The sources of Visser's information are not known, but the views he conveyed to Papen did not conform to the position of the Chamberlain government. Visser told Papen that the question of the return of the former German colonies would apparently not present any difficulty and that any plan for the reconstruction of Polish and Czech states must take into account the fact that the British must be able to make peace without loss of face. Papen replied that, in the present situation, Visser's hopes for peace did not appear likely of fulfillment. He agreed, however, to inform Berlin of the conversation. Ribbentrop responded by requesting Papen to thank Visser and to tell him that "England had wanted war and would now get it."[37]

There was little the Low Countries could do in the spring of 1940 but await events. On May 10, 1940, the invasion came. Within five days, the Netherlands had fallen, and Belgium surrendered on May 28.

The position of the Low Countries in the first months of the war was a difficult one. They could avoid involvement in the conflict only if it were ended quickly by a negotiated settlement. But as their efforts demonstrated, this goal was impossible of fulfillment. Hitler had chosen to use force in the attempt to establish his hegemony over Europe. The British and French had abandoned their earlier efforts to satisfy Hitler and had gone to war. Once the war began, it was destined to run its course. Hitler was unwilling to moderate his demands and limit his ambitions, and the western Allies could not make peace on Germany's terms.

---

[1] Proclamation of Neutrality, September 3, 1939, Netherlands Orange Book (Leyden, 1940), no. 2, pp. 8-14. Eelco Nicholas van Kleffens, Juggernaut Over Holland (New York, 1941), pp. 19-20.

[2] Belgium: The Official Account of What Happened, 1939-1940 (London, 1941), Appendix 1, pp. 53-56; Appendix 6, pp. 69-70.

[3] Bülow to Foreign Ministry, Brussels, September 7, 1939, Documents on German Foreign Policy, Series D, vol. VIII, no. 19, pp. 18-19. (Hereafter cited as D.G.F.P., VIII).

[4] Memorandum by Weizsäcker, Berlin, October 2, 1939, ibid., no. 179, pp. 195-197.

[5] Philipp Bouhler, ed., Der Grossdeutsche Freiheitskampf, Reden Adolf Hitlers, complete edition (Munich, 1942), pp. 67-100.

[6] Davies to Hull, Brussels, October 7, 1939, Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers, 1939, vol. I, 507-508. (Hereafter cited as F.R.U.S., I).

[7] Roosevelt to Davies, Washington, October 19, 1939, ibid., pp. 517-518.

[8] D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 242, note, p. 268.

[9] Testimony of Kroll, June 19, 1946, Trials of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremburg, 14 November 1945-1 October 1946, vol. XVI, 424. (Hereafter cited as I.M.T., XVI.

[10] Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, Diplomat in Peace and War (London, 1949), p. 152.

[11] Memorandum by Weizsäcker, Berlin, October 21, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 288, p. 330. Franz von Papen, Memoirs

(London, 1952), pp. 457-458. Testimony of Papen, June 18, 1946, I.M.T., XVI, 328.

[12] Theodor Eschenburg, "Franz on Papen," Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, vol. I (April 1953), p. 168. Testimony of Papen, June 18, 1946, I.M.T., XVI, 328. N.D. Papen-90, ibid., XL, 582.

[13] van Kleffens, Juggernaut Over Holland, p. 73.

[14] Zech to Foreign Ministry, The Hague, October 7, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 210, p. 235.

[15] Memorandum of the Foreign Ministry, undated, ibid., no. 242, p. 269.

[16] D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 352, note, p. 384. Hans Erwin Leitner, Das Haben Wir Nicht Gewusst, 1937-1940 (Eschwege, 1949), pp. 146-147. Ernst von Weizsäcker, Erinnerungen (Munich, 1950), p. 272.

[17] Gordon to Hull, The Hague, November 7, 1939, F.R.U.S., I, 523. Davies to Hull, Brussels, November 8, 1939, ibid., p. 526. General van Overstraeten, Albert I. Leopold III (Bruges, 1950), pp. 407-408. Paul-Henri Spaak, The Continuing Battle: Memoirs of a European, 1936-1966 (Boston, 1972), p. 22.

[18] Belgium: The Official Account, Appendix II, p. 79. Memorandum by Seigfried, Berlin, November 7, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 332, pp. 383-384.

[19] van Kleffens, Juggernaut Over Holland, p. 51.

[20] Davies to Hull, Brussels, November 8, 1939, F.R.U.S., I, 528.

[21] Bülow to Foreign Ministry, Brussels, November 11 /12/, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 349, pp. 400-401.

[22] Bülow to Foreign Ministry, Brussels, November 8, 1939, ibid., no. 334, p. 386.

[23] van Kleffens, Juggernaut Over Holland, p. 52.

[24] D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 332, note, p. 384.

[25] Quoted in John W. Wheeler-Bennett, King George VI: His Life and Reign (New York, 1958), p. 426.

[26] Quoted in Iain MacLeod, Neville Chamberlain (New York, 1962), p. 279.

[27] Kennedy to Hull, London, November 8, 1939, F.R.U.S., I, 526, 527.

[28] Bullitt to Hull, Paris, November 8, 1939, ibid., pp. 524-529.

[29] Louise W. Holborn, ed., War and Peace Aims of the United Nations, September 1, 1939-December 31, 1942 (Boston, 1943), p. 161.

[30] Kennedy to Hull, London, November 10, 1939, F.R.U.S., I, 530-531.

[31] Halder Diary (mimeographed Nuremberg document), November 7, 1939.

[32] Memorandum by Weizsäcker, Berlin, November 8, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 336, pp. 387-388. Attolico to Ciano, Berlin, November 8, 1939, I Documenti Diplomatici Italiani, 9th Series, vol. II, no. 136, p. 99.

[33] Memorandum by Ribbentrop, Berlin, November 14, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 356 and note, pp. 407-408.

[34] Ibid., no. 356, note, p. 409. Kirk to Hull, Berlin, November 15, 1939, F.R.U.S., I, 532-533.

[35] van Kleffens, Juggernaut Over Holland, p. 53.

[36] Circular of the Foreign Ministry, Berlin, November 18, 1939, D.G.F.P., VIII, no. 373, pp. 424-425.

[37] Memorandum by Weizsäcker, Berlin, March 26, 1940, Documents on German Foreign Policy, Series D, vol. IX, no. 12 and note, pp. 28-29.

"PROTESTANT CHURCH SPOKESMEN, UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, AND THE ANTI-CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGNS, 1940-1959"

Joe P. Dunn

Separation of church and state is a basic Protestant tenet; but from the Puritans on, Protestants have attempted to influence the political process. In the late 19th century, the social gospel movement decreed that social and political activity was a major function of organized religion. From its birth in 1908, the Federal Council of Churches was an active political lobbyist. Several individual denominations, particularly historic pacifists, formed activist agencies in the early decades of the century. Between the wars, politically conscious churches spoke to a range of concerns including prohibition, labor relations, immigration policy, social justice legislation, and matters of war and peace.

World War II was the major watershed in Protestant activity. During the war and immediate years following, most major denominations opened some form of representation in the nation's capital. These ranged from avowed lobbying agencies to "listening posts or public relations centers" for denominations particularly concerned with separation of church and state. Catholic and Jewish agencies also maintained Washington offices as did several Protestant church-associated organizations such as the National Council for Prevention of War, National Service Board for Religious Objectors, Fellowship of Reconciliation, and Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.[1]

A number of new concerns for the churches emerged: the rights of conscientious objectors, the United Nations, colonialism, atomic weaponry, U.S.-Soviet relations, American foreign aid, the Red Scare, and civil and human rights, to name but a few. But no issue stirred more emotion over a longer time than the question of peacetime conscription; greatest attention centered on several attempts to enact a universal military training (UMT) obligation. The anti-conscription campaigns provide a good example of the dynamics of political activity of Protestant church spokesmen in the postwar decades.

The draft employed during World War I ended with the peace, and a brief attempt to gain universal military training was unsuccessful. Although interest in military training waned during the isolationist interwar years, a few organizations such as the Military Training Camps Association pursued the goals of preparedness and compulsory military service. After long years of activity, the Association finally got a peacetime conscription bill before Congress in the summer of 1940. At the same time, they launched a national conscription campaign.[2]

Hearings on the Selective Service Act, or Burke-Wadsworth Bill (named after its respective sponsors in the Senate and House), took place in both houses' Military Affairs Committee in July and August. Supporters of the bill included the military services, American Legion, National Guard Association, National Association of Manufacturers, Junior Chamber of Congress, and several other veterans, patriotic, and civic organizations. Although at first reluctant to confront such a controversial issue in an election year, President Franklin Roosevelt finally endorsed the bill openly and threw his considerable political weight behind passage. The bill's opponents included farm, labor, educational, civil liberty, and civil rights organizations. But the most vocal opposition came from the active pacifist lobby including such groups as the National Council for Prevention of War, Fellowship of Reconciliation, War Resister's League, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva Peace Fellowship, Committee on Militarism in Education, Youth Committee Against War, scores of local and regional peace groups, and the lobbying agencies of the Quakers, Brethren, and Mennonites. Despite its numbers, the pacifist coalition, unlike the pro-conscription forces, was neither well organized nor wealthy.[3]

Protestant church leadership, which tended to be pacifist inclined at this time, was active also in the anti-conscription alliance. The social-political action agencies of the Congregational and Christian Church, the Disciples of Christ, the Methodist Church, and the Federal Council of Churches particularly were involved. The periodical organs of each of these bodies maintained strong anti-conscription editorial policies. Moreover, The Christian Century, the influential voice of liberal interdenominational Protestantism, adamantly condemned peacetime conscription at every opportunity. The National

Catholic Welfare Conference and the Catholic Press Association joined Protestants against conscription.

Although the opposition was formidable, passage of the Selective Service Act came as no surprise to its opponents. Since the mid-thirties, pacifists had considered a national draft law inevitable and they had prepared for the eventuality. When conscription was initiated, protection of the right of conscientious objection would become paramount. In late 1939, representatives of the Quakers, Brethren, and Mennonites formulated an alternative service program in lieu of military participation and presented the plan to Roosevelt and his military advisors. The President approved the general concept and authorized a series of negotiations between the pacifist representatives and the Selective Service administration. The final result was the Civilian Public Service (CPS) program, an institutionalized system of alternative service under civilian direction and administration. The pacifist churches assumed the complete financial burden for the program and most of the administrative tasks under strict federal directives. The pacifists created a National Service Board for Religious Objectors (NSBRO) to direct CPS. As the war progressed, more groups joined the NSBRO and assumed financial and administrative obligations; but the three pacifist churches bore most of the burden throughout the war. Operating in the unfriendly wartime climate with a hostile military overseeing activities, CPS suffered from monumental problems of organization, coordination, administration, and finance. All the problems, however, were not external as church sponsors bickered continually among themselves over policy, administration, and finances. CPS personnel were not always the most cooperative individuals or the easiest to administer. Finally, some conscientious objectors, especially the Jehovah's Witnesses, refused even to participate in CPS.[4]

Except for traditional pacifists, most church spokesmen accepted the draft during the war; however, a new controversy emerged which would lead to several major postwar conscription confrontations. In April 1943, Roosevelt advocated a postwar youth training program. In January 1944, the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, Andrew J. May (D., Ky.), introduced a bill proposing a year of universal military training (UMT) for all seventeen-year-old males. Numerous military spokesmen, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Chamber of Commerce, and Eleanor Roosevelt endorsed UMT during the year. The President's State of the Union address in January 1945 proclaimed UMT essential. During the following months, an attempt to enact a special draft to acquire nurses and another to obtain manpower for war industries received little support; but opponents believed that these were first steps toward universal conscription.[5]

In the summer of 1945, a special House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy convened to consider UMT. More than 150 witnesses appeared and over 100 written statements were added to the hearing's record. Spokesmen from several Protestant denominations testified with most denouncing UMT or requesting that the decision be postponed until after the war. Huber Klemme, Executive Secretary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church's Commission on Christian Social Action, was typical. He argued that: (1) UMT had questionable military value as future security should be through the United Nations rather than large military establishments; (2) the interruption of education, marriage, and other normal youth activities in the home community for military service with its dubious moral atmosphere and regimented, undemocratic aspects would constitute "a shameful misuse of manpower" detrimental to society in the long run; (3) reliance upon the military as a source of health care, educational programs, patriotic training, and postwar employment was an inappropriate response to society's social, economic, and political problems and would establish dangerous precedents.[6]

Dr. Herbert J. Burghstahler, speaking for the Federal Council of Churches, submitted statements from nine denominational members of the Council, the Southern Baptist Convention (not a member), and 31 national, state, and local church and religious groups. All opposed conscription or at least called for postponing consideration.[7] Spokesmen from the United Lutheran Church, Disciples of Christ, Northern Baptist Convention, and Presbyterian Church USA, urged deferral. In a letter, Charles F. Boss, Jr., of the Methodist Commission on World Peace stated that consideration of UMT at this time would weaken the churches' efforts in support of the new United Nations Charter as it would cause diversion of resources and energies to the campaign against UMT.[8]

Although the overwhelming concensus of church voices opposed UMT, a few church spokesmen did speak out in favor of the idea. Most prominent was Daniel A. Poling, the respected editor of The Christian Herald, who stressed the discipline and moral values of military service as most positive experiences for American youth. Bemoaning declining church membership, "a problem of tragic proportions," Poling was moved to exclaim that UMT would not solve the problem but would be a step in that direction: "Certainly no plan now proposed within religious groups offers so large a hope for strengthening of America in her moral and spiritual life as does this measure ..."[9] Other individual church spokesmen, endorsing UMT, emphasized the values of discipline which they believed that postwar youth badly needed.

The only religious organization on record in support of UMT was the ultra-fundamentalist American Council of Christian Churches, the creation and platform of militant supra-patriot Carl McIntire. In his testimony, McIntire railed against "atheistic Communism," invoked Biblical prescriptions for military action against the Soviet Union, and decried the dangers of "aggressive pacifism" which threatened the country. To McIntire, UMT was necessary, "both American and Biblical," and "a blessing to the land." Moreover, it would work against the growing power of liberalism which McIntire referred to as a "totalitarian ideology which is growing within our bounds under the leadership of certain church and educational circles and radical labor quarters."[10]

In its final report in early July, the Select Committee endorsed the principle of UMT and called for specific legislation. In September, President Truman sent Congress a conscription bill which included a UMT option; the House Military Affairs Committee began hearings on the bill in November. During the summer, the churches had requested that consideration be postponed until the end of the war; now several wished to defer the decision until after demobilization was completed. Many denominations had formally recorded a definitive stand on UMT. Despite their interest, the churches did not appear at the hearings as they had in the past. Only the Federal Council, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Mennonite Central Committee, and the Methodist Commission on World Pease testified.

The Federal Council's testimony surprisingly stirred considerable controversy within the church community. Dr. Walter

W. Van Kirk, chairman of the Council's Department of International Justice and Goodwill, who usually spoke for the Council on such issues, was not able to attend; and a local Washington minister, Dr. John W. Rustin, was asked to present the Council's statement. Before he read the Council's statement, Rustin attempted to validate his credentials. He stated emphatically that he was not "one of these fanatical pacifists," and boasted several different times that 550 men from his congregation had served during the war; moreover, his church had not produced a single conscientious objector. This he credited to his counseling efforts. Although the Federal Council statement clearly opposed compulsory peacetime military training, during the questioning, Rustin's own resistance diminished. By the end of his appearance, he had gone so far as to personally endorse UMT if the training came in the summers rather than in a full year away from home.[11]

The minister's remarks shocked many church leaders. Rev. Charles R. Bell, who testified just after Rustin, referred to his predecessor's performance as "one of the most deplorable episodes I have witnessed anywhere." He continued that if this represented Federal Council thinking, then conscription advocates had nothing to fear from the churches.[12] Van Kirk also was appalled and later appeared before the committee to "clarify" the Federal Council position.

Carl McIntire appeared again to continue his tirade against liberal influences within the church. His remarks were even more dogmatic than in his earlier testimony during the summer. He proclaimed that the United States was God's chosen instrument against the evils of socialism and communism in the world. Powerful military might was essential and UMT, vitally necessary. Moreover, it would also provide discipline, control, and instill patriotism. Though expressed in rather pontifical terms, McIntire's themes of discipline, order, patriotism, and moral influences were attractive attributes of UMT for many. Throughout the UMT hearings of the forties and fifties, many Congressmen expressed concern over declining patriotism, morals, respect, and discipline among youth. To them, UMT suggested a panacea: mitigating against these dangers while simultaneously increasing national security, improving national health, and providing vocational training. McIntire proclaimed that he, rather than the scores of other church spokesmen opposed to UMT, reflected the true feelings of church parishioners across the land. He was probably correct; at least, it can be said without hesitation that the Federal Council and other denominational spokesmen tended to be more liberal on social and political issues than their parishioner constituencies.[13]

Congress remained undecided on UMT and the bill died in committee in early 1946. If opponents had registered some impact, their victory was short lived; with the temporary shelving of universal training, Congress turned its attention to selective service. Pacifists and many other churchmen rejected any form of compulsory peacetime military service; but the draft did not engender the same furor as UMT. Besides the pacifist churches, only the Southern Baptists and the Methodist Commission on World Peace testified in the 1946 draft hearings. Congress overwhelmingly extended selective service for another year into mid-1947.

Some important events transpired before the next UMT hearings in June 1947. Quite important was the emergence of a new anti-conscription organization, the National Council Against Conscription (NCAC). During the war several anti-conscription groups arose, went through consolidations and name changes, and faded away. The NCAC, formed in November 1945, struggled financially but survived. In late 1947 it assumed responsibility for a bulletin, Conscription News, and named the periodical's founder and editor, John M. Swomley, Jr., as Director of NCAC. Swomley, a young Methodist seminary graduate serving in Washington as youth secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and Congressional liaison for the National Council of Methodist Youth, soon became the leading figure in the anti-conscription campaigns. NCAC served as a catalyst and link between church, educational, labor, civil rights, and other anti-conscription forces. Conscription News, a compendium of anti-conscription information, was the mouthpiece and chronicle of the campaign. The churches were Swomley's closest allies.[14]

Proponents of UMT were busy also. In late 1946, the Army created an "experimental" model UMT unit at Ft. Knox, Kentucky, to demonstrate the training that participants would experience if the UMT program were adopted. Intending to reap maximum benefits from the model unit, the Army initiated an extensive publicity campaign distributing pamphlets, fliers, and news releases on the unit. Dozens of articles appeared in newspapers and popular periodicals. Various civic, women's, church, and other groups were invited to visit the unit.

In early 1947, Conscription News and The Christian Century investigated the Ft. Knox experiment and pointed out a number of deceptions and irregularities.[15] In the summer a House subcommittee found the Army guilty of improper use of government funds as well as other violations.[16] While the Army was temporarily embarrassed by the affair, its public relations campaign for UMT was only minimally curtailed.

In December 1946, Truman appointed a President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training and instructed it to develop a case which he could use to win Congressional approval for UMT. In June 1947, the commission's report proclaimed UMT essential. Church spokesmen immediately attacked the report and the composition of the commission. Even though most church organizations opposed UMT, the President had chosen two church representatives--Daniel A. Poling and Father Edmund A. Walsh--who were UMT advocates. Moreover, the commission delegates representing the educational community and civil rights organizations were UMT supporters even though these groups were almost unanimously on record against UMT. Finally, church leaders noted that Truman had selected no representatives from labor nor farm groups, two constituencies most affected by, and most adamantly against, UMT. The NCAC published An Analysis of the Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training and distributed 30,000 copies to newspaper editors, educators, and church leaders; the Presbyterian Church USA distributed another 10,000 copies. Swomley reported that practically every newspaper in the country carried a story on the NCAC release with front page coverage in many major city dailies.[17]

Charles Boss of the Methodist Commission on World Peace wrote a personal letter to Daniel Poling offering his own lengthy objections to the commission's report and Poling's role.[18] Later in an interview in December, Poling implied that the Federal Council might soon reverse its position and endorse UMT. Church leaders emphatically denied Poling's speculation.[19]

The House Armed Services Committee held UMT hearings again in June 1947, with the same parade of witnesses and arguments as in 1945. In 1945 church spokesmen had called for delay as wartime was not the best climate for rational, dispassionate consideration of the issue. They wished to wait until after demobilization when peacetime manpower needs would be more apparent. While continuing to urge slow and deliberate consideration rather than proceeding to a vote, the churches had changed the nature of their tactics. They now argued that if Congress had not deemed UMT imperative during the war, surely it was not necessary now in peacetime. The committee reported out a UMT bill one day before the Congressional session ended, but Leo Allen (R., Ill.), the powerful chairman of the House Rules Committee and a staunch UMT opponent, kept the bill from coming to a floor vote.

UMT passage appeared quite likely in 1948. The Czechoslovakian coup in February intensified American fears of Communist expansion. In March Truman asked Congress for the European Recovery Program, temporary revival of the draft--which had lapsed in 1947, and UMT. From the first, UMT had been considered a Democrat proposal; primary opposition came from a core of isolationist-conservative Republicans who worked in coalition with a few liberal Democrats. Even though the powers in the conservative Republican dominated 80th Congress--Robert Taft, Senate Majority Leader; Kenneth Wherry, Senate Majority Whip; Joseph Martin, Speaker of the House; Dewey Short, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; Leslie Arends, House Majority Whip; and Allen--remained committed against UMT, Congressional opposition on the whole was less pronounced than in previous years. As the Cold War hardened, many legislators reassessed their positions. As one leading scholar explains: "The 1945-47 alliance of left and right in opposition to 'militaristic conscription' came apart in 1948 as most conservatives found it more important to be anti-Soviet than anti-military."[20]

The 1947 UMT bill was still in the House Rules Committee where, despite considerable pressure, Leo Allen kept it for the entire session. The Administration chose to try to break the deadlock by concentrating first on the Senate. The 1948 Senate hearings, which began in late March, were the height of the UMT confrontations. Hundreds of individuals and organizations testified. The churches were well represented. They reiterated old themes but focused especially on the growing Cold War mentality and America's increasing reliance upon unilateral military strength rather than the United Nations.

Perennial Methodist spokesman Charles Boss was typical as he outlined an eight point program which proposed extending the Marshall Plan to Eastern Europe, a United States sponsored world disarmament effort, international abolition of conscription under U N auspices, and greater exchange of religious, educational, scientific, artistic, business, and labor leaders between the United States and the Soviet Union. Boss criticized purported American intransigence toward the Soviets and accused Truman of rejecting opportunities to meet with Stalin. Reflecting many churchmen's idealistic faith in discussion and concensus, Boss challenged the President to send two plenipotentiaries to Russia "to sit down with Stalin to come to grips with problems that cannot be solved by name calling and saber rattling."[21]

Most church spokesmen shared Boss' zeal for accord with the Soviets and ignored the fact that Stalin evidenced less willingness to negotiate and compromise than they credited him. The senators tended to be more "realistic." They granted church spokesmen utmost respect--the slightest hint of discourtesy to church leaders was not prudent politics--but they afforded them little credence. When Senators did press, many church spokesmen could offer nothing more than cliches and platitudes. The inability to speak practically to contemporary realities epitomized the failure of much church testimony.

Even at the peak of the Cold War, the UMT bill failed again as the Senate Armed Services Committee refused to report the bill out of committee. Several factors doomed UMT again in 1948. The anti-conscription coalition still contained powerful forces. Southern support faded when the original bill was amended to require desegregated UMT units. Robert Taft remained a formidable foe with considerable influence.[22] But the most important impediment was the growing popularity of Air Power as a relatively inexpensive and effective alternative to large, expensive standing armies. Many legislators had come to believe that the nation could not afford all three rearmament measures before them--UMT, the draft, and a larger Air Force--and the latter two seemed to be the most important. Even military solidarity eroded as the Air Force lost interest in UMT when it became evident that the funds for the program would come mainly at Air Force expense. Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington explained that a seventy-group Air Force was more important than UMT and that he would not have testified for UMT if he had known that it would cost the Air Force.[23] While UMT failed, Congress did resurrect the selective service draft at the last minute. The churches offered only minimal resistance.

Truman continued to consider UMT a major priority and attampted without success to revive the issue in 1949. Congress did begin another study of UMT in 1950 but the outbreak of the Korean War caused them to shelve consideration and simply pass an emergency one-year extension of the draft. During the 1951 selective service hearings, the churches maintained a low profile. Hesitant to challenge the draft during wartime, they directed their attention to protection of the rights of conscientious objectors; however, they did speak out against a provision in the new law which lowered the draft age from nineteen to eighteen.[24] Another provision called for the appointment of a National Security Training Commission to submit recommendations to Congress concerning UMT. Truman filled this second "blue ribbon" commission with strong UMT proponents and the group presented its proposals in October 1951. Christian Century devoted its December 1951 issue to a rebuttal; the NCAC responded with another critical pamphlet, The Facts Behind the Report; and the National Council of Churches adopted a new statement against UMT.[25]

In another round of hearings in early 1952, Walter Van Kirk presented the Senate with the most recent statements against UMT of the National Council and several of its members including the American Baptist Convention, Church of the Brethren, Congregational Christian Church, Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Evangelical United Brethren, Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church USA, Society of Friends, United Lutheran Church in America, Disciples of Christ, and the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church.[26] After numerous amendments and much parliamentary maneuvering, the 1952 bill went back to committee and died. As before, unpopularity and expense doomed UMT. Although the issue surfaced several times in the 1952 Presidential campaign and the newly elected Eisenhower was as committed to UMT as his predecessor, 1952 was the last of the major UMT hearings.

In August 1953 Eisenhower appointed his own National Security Training Commission which issued another report proposing UMT when the conscription law expired in 1955. Once again the churches rallied to the 1955 hearings with all the old-timers and some new voices such as the United Lutheran Church and the National Association of Evangelicals making their first appearances; but the spirit of the earlier campaigns was missing. After bitter haggling, Congress passed a National Reserve Plan which was not UMT but contained features which opponents considered "a foot in the door." The Christian Century chastised the church community for its ineffective voice and branded the compromise conscription legislation "a hodge podge, a conglomeration of unrelated and in some instances conflicting provisions, which in operation will satisfy nobody." Although simplistic and overblown, the assessment proved to be essentially correct.[27]

The churches' interest in conscription declined in the late fifties. Lessening international tensions, dropping military manpower demands, and an increasing procurement pool meant that the draft affected a smaller percentage of American youth. The Fifth World Order Conference, sponsored by the National Council of Churches, passed a resolution against the draft at its November, 1958 meeting; but activity was sparse. Conscription articles largely disappeared from the religious press. John Swomley attempted to revive the fervor of the old crusade in time of the 1959 draft extension hearings, but the challenge fell on deaf ears as church participation in the hearings was minimal and unspirited.[28] Some of the giants of the earlier campaigns were no longer active. Frederick Libby of the National Council for Prevention of War, who had appeared at virtually every conscription hearing since 1940, retired in 1954 and his organization disbanded. Walter Van Kirk of the National Council of Churches died in 1956; and Charles Boss left the Methodist Board of World Peace for a new position in 1957.

With the overwhelming extension (381-20 in the House and 90-1 in the Senate), John Swomley symbolically closed out the long anti-conscription campaigns. He published the last issue of Conscription News in October 1959, disbanded NCAC with the postscript that the organization had achieved its purpose and had never been conceived as a permanent body, and left Washington to become a professor of social ethics at a Methodist seminary in the midwest.[29]

The early sixties witnessed little change; however, by late decade the unpopularity of the war in Vietnam revived an anti-conscription movement and once again the churches were in the forefront. Just as in the heyday of the late forties, the religious press teemed with articles against conscription. Church leaders testified, marched, and demonstrated, gaining a prominent place in the protest activities of the era. With the end of the war came an end of the draft; but it is likely that some form of conscription will return in the not too distant future. If tradition is any guide, church leaders will be major opponents of compulsory service especially against any proposals for universal military training.

How does one evaluate the role of church leaders in the anti-conscription campaigns? Certainly the churches were one of the most active participants. The Federal Council of Churches (and its successor the National Council), most Protestant denominations, and several Catholic and Jewish groups took anti-conscription stands. Among Protestants, the Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterian (USA), Disciples of Christ, and the Northern Baptist Convention were the most involved. But even the politically reticent Lutherans voiced their opposition and by the mid-fifties the very conservative, fundamentalist National Association of Evangelicals formally testified before Congress against the draft. Of the largest Protestant denominations, only three took no stand on conscription issues during the era: the Presbyterian Church U S, the Episcopal Church, and the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Only one church group, the American Council of Christian Churches, formally endorsed conscription.

Judgments of conduct, performance, and significance are more difficult; the assessment is a mixed one. Churchmen's trust in the U N, the Soviet Union, and international concensus was overly sanguine and naive. Their apocalyptic fears of UMT were undoubtedly exaggerated. Their impact on Congress, through resolutions and testimony, was minimal. But church leaders did receive widespread newspaper coverage which, in concert with their own publicity efforts, exerted some impact on public opinion. As moral conscience, critic of evolving Cold War psychology, and articulate spokesmen of dissent, they performed a useful role in the political process. If their own power was slight, as church spokesmen worked and aligned themselves with other constituencies such as labor, farm, and educational organizations with greater political clout, they did exercise some influence on policy formation. This impact was often noted in the era's press. Whatever the evaluation of their influence, one conclusion is safe: the anti-conscription campaigns provide a good case study of the church's political involvement in the post-war era.

---

[1] See Luke Eugene Ebersole, Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951); and Thomas Keehn and Kenneth Underwood, "Protestants in Political Action," Social Action 16 (June, 1950), pp. 5-39.

[2] For background of the Selective Service Act, see John J. O'Sullivan, "From Voluntarism to Conscription: Congress and Selective Service, 1940-1945" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972), pp. 1-120; Samuel R. Spencer, Jr., "A History of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, from Inception to Enactment" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951); and John M. Swomley, Jr., "A Study of the Universal Military Campaign, 1944-1952" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1959), pp. 8-44.

[3] Frederick J. Libby of the National Council for Prevention of War estimated that the combined resources of the pacifist lobby were less than $5,000. See Libby, "The Draft Has a Past," memorandum, dated May 1943, National Council for Prevention of War Papers, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

[4] For full account of the fight for conscientious objector's rights and the origins and functioning of Civilian Public Service, see E. Raymond Wilson, "Evolution of the C.O. Provisions in the 1940 Conscription Bill," Journal of Quaker History 65 #1 (Spring 1975), pp. 3-15; Philip E. Jacob, The Origins of Civilian Public Service (Washington: National Service Board for Religious Objectors, 1946); and Mulford Q. Sibley and Philip E. Jacob, Conscription of Conscience: The American State and the Conscientious Objector, 1940-1947 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1952). Also see Melvin Gingerich, Service For

Peace: A History of the Mennonite Civilian Public Service (Akron, PA: Mennonite Central Committee, 1949); David Wagler and Roman Haber, eds., The Story of the Amish in Civilian Public Service (Boonsboro, MD: n. pub., 1945); Anton T. Boisen, The Morale of the Conscientious Objectors in Church Operated Service Units (Elgin, Ill.: Brethren Publishing House, 1946); Leslie Eisen, Pathways of Peace (Elgin, Ill.: Brethren Publishing House, 1948); An Introduction to Friends Public Service (Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1945); and The Experience of the American Friends Service Committee in Civilian Public Service (Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, n.d.).

[5] For fuller development, see O'Sullivan, "From Voluntarism to Conscription," pp. 137-140.

[6] House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, Universal Military Training, hearings pursuant to H. Res. 465 (79th Cong., 1st sess., 1945), pp. 158-161.

[7] Ibid., pp. 143-158.

[8] Ibid., Part II, p. 646. See supporting editorial in Christian Century 62 (June 20, 1945), p. 723.

[9] House Select Committee, UMT, pp. 508-518.

[10] House Select Committee, UMT, pp. 472-477. For fuller account of McIntire and the American Council of Christian Churches, see John A. Stroman, "The American Council of Christian Churches: A Study of its Origins, Leaders, and Characteristic Positions" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1966); Ralph Lord Roy, Apostles of Discord: A Study of Organized Bigotry and Disruption on the Fringes of Protestantism (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953), pp. 186-202; Ralph Lord Roy, Communism and the Churches (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1960); and Benjamin R. Epstein, Danger on the Right (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 100-114.

[11] House Military Affairs, Universal Military Training, hearings on H.R. 515 (79th Cong., 1st sess., 1945), pp. 691-698.

[12] Charles Bell to Walter Van Kirk, letter, December 17, 1945; Van Kirk to Bell, letter, December 27, 1945, National Council of Churches Archives, New York City.

[13] House Military Affairs, UMT, pp. 410-415.

[14] Swomley, "Universal Military Training Campaign," is a valuable primary source, both history and memoir of National Council Against Conscription activities during the era.

[15] Conscription News, January 16, 1947; Action Sheet accompanying Conscription News, February 6, 1947; Conscription News. May 8, 15, 22, 29, 1947; Alexander Stewart, "Is 'Umtee' the Answer?" Christian Century 64 (May 28, 1947), pp. 680-682.

[16] House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, Publicity and Propaganda Subcommittee, Investigations of War Department Publicity and Propaganda in Relation to Universal Military Training (80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947); and full committee hearings with same title; House Report 1073 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947).

[17] See Conscription News, January 9, 1947; "Will They Study or Propagandize?" Christian Century 64 (January 1, 1947), p. 4; "President's Men Ask for Conscription" and "Publicity Campaign Lauds 'UMTEES'," Christian Century 64 (June 11, 1947), p. 731; Swomley, "University Military Training Campaign," pp. 125-127, 209-213; E. Raymond Wilson to Roswell Barnes, letter, July 3, 1947, NCC Archives.

[18] Charles Boss to Daniel A. Poling, letter, June 24, 1947, NCC Archives.

[19] "Immediate Preparedness Required," Philadelphia Bulletin, December 11, 1947; see William E. Lampe to Walter Van Kirk, letter, December 12, 1947, with enclosed letter of protest to Philadelphia Bulletin, NCC Archives.

[20] James M. Gerhardt, The Draft and Public Policy: Issues in Military Manpower Procurement, 1945-1970 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1971), p. 90.

[21] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Universal Military Training (80th Cong., 2nd sess., 1948), pp. 522-528.

[22] Throughout the forties and fifties, Taft maintained close ties with church leaders and other anti-conscriptionists. His wife, a pacifist, was an officer of the National Council for

Prevention of War and his brother Charles was President of the Federal Council of Churches in the late forties. As Senate Majority Leader in the 80th Congress, Taft directed his staff and that of the Republican Policy Committee to work closely with NCAC. Swomley reports that the Policy Committee staff shared information and research loads with the NCAC and often provided him with "important behind-the-scenes developments of the Hill." Swomley, "Universal Military Training Campaign," pp. 345, 407-408.

[23] Drew Pearson, "Washington Merry-Go-Round," *Washington Post*, April 14, 1948.

[24] See house Armed Services, *Universal Military Training*, hearings on H.R. 1752 (82nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1951), pp. 561-570, 714-721, 831-837. Swomley on the same topic, *Ibid*., pp. 580-586; and Senate Armed Services, Preparedness Subcommittee, *Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951*, hearings on S. 1 (82nd Cong., 1st sess., 1951), pp. 936-943. Also see "What Can A Young Man Think," *Christian Century* 68 (April 25, 19510, p. 515; "Should 18-year-olds Be Soldiers," flier distributed by the National Council Against Conscription Papers, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

[25] U.S. Congress, *Universal Military Training: Foundation of Enduring National Strength*, First Report to the Congress by the National Security Training Commission, October, 1951, House Document 315 (82nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1951); *The Facts Behind the Report: An Analysis of the Report of the National Security Training Commission* (Washington: National Council Against Conscription, January 1952), NCAC Papers.

[26] House Armed Services, *Universal Military Training*, hearings pursuant to H.R. 5904 (82nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1952), p. 3006; Senate Armed Services, *National Security Training Corps Act*, hearings on S. 2441 (82nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1952), pp. 304-314.

[27] "The Churches and Military Service," *Christian Century* 72 (August 19, 1955), pp. 917-919.

[28] John M. Swomley, Jr., "End Conscription in 1959," *Christian Century* (January 7, 1959), pp. 14-17; also see Swomley, "The

Growing Power of the Military," The Progressive (January 1959), pp. 24-28.

[29] Swomley, Report of the Director, December 15, 1959; and Swomley, Letter to NCAC mailing list, December 30, 1959, NCAC Papers. Although NCAC passed from the scene, John Swomley remained in the forefront of the peace activities. He continued his work through his associations with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, American Friends Service Committee, Methodist Board of World Peace, and the National Council of Churches. For a time, he edited a peace newsletter much in the tradition of Conscription News. He was an active Vietnam critic from the first. During the sixties and early seventies, he published several books: The Military Establishment (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), Religion, The State, and the Schools (New York: Pegasus, 1968), American Empire: The Political Ethics of Twentieth Century Conquest (New York: MacMillan, 1970), Liberation Ethics (New York: MacMillan, 1972). He remains today a prolific church activist.

THE HOLINESS-PENTECOSTAL REVIVAL IN THE CAROLINAS, 1896-1940

Robert F. Martin

Few people think of 1896 as a year of religious significance. Any such association probably results from an awareness that this was the year in which a youthful Nebraskan spellbinder wove the rhetoric of popular discontent and the vivid imagery of the King James Bible into two of the most memorable sentences in the history of American political campaigning.[1] Yet for several small groups of Carolinians, the year would remain a spiritual landmark long after William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" oratory had become irrelevant; for in that year zealous evangelists kindled three revivals which bore fruit in the formation of several new Protestant sects.

Each of these 1896 revivals was an expression of the holiness awakening which had swept portions of American Protestantism, especially its Methodist bodies, during the three decades following the Civil War. The central tenet of this post-war holiness crusade was the doctrine of sanctification. Holiness advocates believed that regeneration, or conversion, while it was adequate for salvation, nevertheless left a residue of sin. Sanctification, or the second blessing, was therefore necessary for the purification of the whole man. Holiness theorists differed in their interpretations as to the exact nature of this blessing and the precise time at which it occurred. They all agreed, however, that it should be the objective of every devout Christian. While the personal dimension of holiness was most often emphasized, its social implications were not lost on many perfectionists concerned about what they perceived as the decadence of Gilded Age America. Aspiring to sanctification could lead not only to a higher Christian life for the individual but also to the regeneration of the church and society.[2]

Nowhere was the holiness awakening more apparent than within American Methodism. John Wesley had written much, perhaps too much, about sanctification and Christian perfection and his theological heirs poured over his writings and those of his interpreters to determine the meaning of the experience and the new life it inaugurated. Wesley's writings lent themselves to a variety of interpretations.[3] This fact, coupled with the impact upon the movement of numerous economic, social and psychological forces, contributed to a growing complexity and divergence of opinion within the crusade.

In the northeastern states where the post-war holiness revival was initially strongest, especially among urban, middle class Christians, it manifested itself in the proliferation of extrainstitutional bodies, such as the National Camp Meeting Association for the Promotion of Holiness, and a host of regional and local organizations modeled after the National Association. Through camp meetings, local prayer and study groups and numerous publications, these associations sought to assist seekers after perfection in their pursuit of the higher Christian life. Contrary to the hopes of some holiness advocates, the movement's social impact was minimal, yet it fulfilled at least some of the psychological needs of the tens of thousands of people who flocked to camp meetings and joined local "holiness bands." The crusade, with its camp meetings in placid rural surroundings and its almost familial local prayer and study groups, seems to have provided an escape from a too rapidly changing world.[4]

As the movement expanded out of the northeastern and Middle Atlantic states, however, its character, composition and function began to change. While some western and southern holiness people shared the middle class respectability of their northeastern counterparts, an increasing number came from lower socio-economic levels. These included tenant farmers, small land owners, artisans and many others who found their material, social or personal circumstances unsatisfying but who had not yet despaired of achieving a better life. For these people the revival represented less a retreat from the present world than a devout and disciplined avenue toward a more rewarding way of life. Historian Timothy Smith believes that by 1885 the holiness movement had in fact split into two distinct groups: "One, largely rural, was more emotionally demonstrative, emphasized rigid standards of dress and behavior, and often scorned ecclesiastical discipline. The other was urban, intellectual, and somewhat less zealous about outward standards of holiness."[5] It was the former group which began posing problems for institutional Methodism.

Although in the years immediately after the Civil War Methodism in both the North and South was rather receptive to the holiness revival, as the crusade became increasingly tainted with radicalism, that is, obsessed with the experience of sanctification, the outward manifestations of holiness and such doctrines as faith healing and premillennialism, the institutional church in both regions grew first anxious, then hostile. This was especially true of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. In 1870 the Bishops of the church had declared that "nothing is so needed at the present time through all these lands as a genuine and powerful revival of scriptural holiness."[6] Twenty years later, however, the southern church's leadership had become convinced that the revival had gotten out of hand. They condemned the perfectionists for their preoccupation with the theory of sanctification and their attitude of spiritual superiority.[7] The ecclesiastical authorities were upset because what had originally been seen as a means of revitalizing Methodism had instead become a divisive force within the church.

While many holiness proponents remained loyal to Methodism, there was, within the radical ranks of the movement, less talk of revitalizing the church, more emphasis on the holiness bands themselves, and a growing sentiment favoring separation from a church which they believed had fallen from the faith. In an effort to lance this festering sore, delegates to the 1898 General Conference adopted legislation forbidding holiness evangelists from conducting meetings within the bounds of a Methodist charge without the local pastor's consent.[8] This hardening opposition, combined with the growing radicalism of many perfectionists and the socio-economic and intellectual factors which lay at the heart of these developments, rendered schism practically inevitable.

During the closing years of the nineteenth and the opening years of the twentieth century, thousands of Methodists as well as Protestants of other persuasions left their traditional churches. These separatists usually joined with like-minded believers to form independent congregations or nascent sects. Between 1894 and 1900 more than twenty-three holiness sectarian organizations were born.[9] After the turn of the century the holiness movement itself was swept by yet another wave of revivalism which transformed a number of the newly-founded holiness bodies into even more radical pentecostal sects.

The Carolinas were not generally racked by radical holiness unrest until 1896. In December of that year, a flamboyant holiness evangelist from the Mid West began a series of revivals in the Southeast with a meeting at the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Piedmont, South Carolina. Benjamin Harden Irwin, who visited the state at the invitation of its Wesleyan Methodist leadership, came as the apostle of both a new doctrine and a new dimension in religious experience. In addition to preaching the traditional holiness doctrine of sanctification, Irwin taught that there was a third work of God's grace, the "baptism of fire."[10] This blessing often had a convulsive effect upon its recipients, a fact which gave the Nebraskan evangelist's services a dramatically emotional quality reminiscent of the more spectacular occurrences of the Second Great Awakening.

The message preached by Irwin, first at Piedmont, then in meetings at Columbia, Anderson and Central, South Carolina, represented the most radical expression to date of the holiness awakening. Enthusiasts believed that the Fire-Baptized way represented the full flowering of the holiness crusade. Opponents regarded it as the movement gone to seed. Whatever the case, this unique revival was to have a decided influence upon subsequent religious developments in the Southeast.

Irwin, a lawyer who had deserted the bar for first the Baptist, then the holiness pulpit, had launched his movement in the Iowa-Nebraska region in the mid-eighteen nineties, after having discovered in the writings of John Fletcher, a colleague of John Wesley's, the concept of an experience beyond sanctification. Fletcher's explanation of the "baptism of burning love" was at best nebulous. Irwin, however, seizing upon the concept, renamed it, interpreted it as the zenith of religious experience and made it the keystone of his theology. Though hardly more explicit than Fletcher had been in his explanation of the experience, Irwin seems to have regarded the "baptism of fire" as an endowment of power from the Holy Spirit.[11] It was, however, the content rather than the meaning of the experience that generated the most interest both within and without the Fire-Baptized movement.

In addition to teaching the doctrine of a third blessing, Irwin preached a premillenarian eschatology and imposed upon his followers a moral code ascetic even by holiness standards. He required those who would follow the Fire-Baptized way to avoid oath-bound secret societies; abstain from the production, use or sale of tobacco; refrain from the use of morphine; shun pork and all other foods proscribed by the dietary laws of the Old Testament; and forego the wearing of costly apparel and ornamentation, including neckties. So rigid were the devotees of this movement that more than one Fire-Baptized exhorter is said to have exclaimed, "I had rather have a rattlesnake around my neck than a necktie." Those who violated the sect's moral code were expected to make both public confession of and, if possible, restitution for all their sins.[12]

The unorthodox idea of a third blessing, coupled with an emotionalism and moral rigidity extravagant even by holiness standards, brought ridicule and scorn upon Irwin and his disciples, even from some of the more radical holiness advocates. Nevertheless, the movement steadily gained momentum. Invited to leave the Iowa Holiness Association in 1895, Irwin later in that year organized Fire-Baptized Holiness Associations in Iowa, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas. In 1896 the Fire-Baptized apostle introduced his revival into the Southeast. During the next two years he organized state associations in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and North Carolina.

These state associations, themselves rather loose-knit affairs, were entirely independent of each other. The only cohesive force among them was their peculiar doctrine and the personality of their founder. By the summer of 1898, however, Irwin was ready to organize his following into a full-fledged sect. From July twenty-eighth to August eighth of that year, delegates from nine states gathered at Anderson, South Carolina to formally organize the Fire-Baptized Holiness Association. This interracial group of conferees assented to the establishment of a highly centralized and autocratic church government with Irwin at its head, and adopted a constitution and doctrinal statement which formalized the movement's teachings and practices.[13]

The Fire-Baptized Association flourished for a time, but suffered catastrophic losses in membership in 1900 when it became known that the General Overseer's emotional experiences had taken a somewhat carnal turn. Having been discovered in "open and gross sin," Irwin relinquished his position as

General Overseer and quickly faded from the scene. His successor as head of the now rapidly disintegrating church was Joseph Hillery King, a native of Anderson County, South Caroline, but a long-time resident of northern Georgia. King's first task was to salvage what he could of the Association. Within a few months of the disclosure of Irwin's improprieties, the western state associations had virtually vanished. By 1904 the church remained organized in only the Carolinas and Georgia. With the headquarters of the organization moved from Iowa to Royston, Georgia, sometime between 1900 and 1904, King began trying to rebuild the sect on the remains of its foundations in the Southeast.[14]

In the same year that Irwin was introducing his Fire-Baptized message into South Carolina an equally zealous, if somewhat less radical evangelist was initiating a new wave of holiness fervor in eastern North Carolina. Ambrose Blackman Crumpler began his work in the Sampson-Wayne-Duplin County area of the Tar Heel state and within a short time had created quite a stir both among religious zealots and more orthodox Methodist ecclesiastical authorities. The former were delighted with the formation, in 1897, of the North Carolina Holiness Association, a direct result of Crumpler's work. The latter viewed this development with concern.

Both Crumpler's message and style were typical of the more fervid southern and western wing of the holiness crusade. While avoiding the theological extremes of Irwin, Crumpler did preach a version of holiness which stressed a profoundly emotional experience of sanctification that inaugurated a life of sinless perfection. His revival services were spectacles which drew seekers and scoffers alike. With a voice reputedly audible for a mile, the young exhorter would call sinners to repentance and the justified to sanctification. Preaching first in Methodist churches, then conducting tent revivals, Crumpler presided over meetings that were characterized by enthusiastic singing, shouting, leaping, jerking, dancing, and trances which sometimes lasted for hours. Having received the second blessing, the sanctified believers dressed plainly, abstained from tobacco and alcoholic beverages, and shunned worldly amusements.

Methodist authorities, concerned over what they deemed the fanaticism of Crumpler's revivals, admonished him to curtail his activities. In the face of this challenge to his work, the evangelist in 1898 withdrew from the Methodist Church and organized a tiny holiness congregation at Goldsboro, North Carolina. But within a year Crumpler had returned to the Methodist fold and, deprived of his guidance, the "Pentecostal Holiness Church" at Goldsboro withered.

Crumpler's return to Methodism signaled no waning of his enthusiasm for holiness; rather, it reflected his belief that his mother church would not enforce its restrictions on holiness evangelism. He was, to his chagrin, mistaken. In November 1899 he was tried for violation of the 1898 ruling. Although acquitted by a church court, Crumpler once again withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. In early 1900 he and several of his associates met at Fayetteville to arrange for the establishment of a new sect to be known as the Pentecostal Holiness Church.[15] Although the church grew slowly at first, numbering only fifteen eastern North Carolina congregations in 1906, thereafter its rate of growth accelerated until by 1911 it could boast forty-nine local churches.[16]

While the Irwin and Crumpler revivals were laying the foundations for new sects in the piedmont and coastal plain of the Carolinas, still another religious awakening was beginning in a remote mountainous region of western North Caroline near the Tennessee border. As early as 1886 a small group of dissatisfied Christians in Monroe County, Tennessee, led by Richard G. Spurling, Sr., a licensed Baptist minister in the Coker Creek community, had organized themselves into a fellowship group known as the Christian Union. Little is known of the activities of this association until some of its members, led by R.G. Spurling, Jr., merged in 1896 with a group of like-minded believers residing in Cherokee County, North Carolina. Earlier in that year three lay evangelists, Silliam Martin, Joe Tipton and Milton McNabb, had sparked a small but characteristically dramatic revival in the vicinity of Camp Creek. This revival precipitated an informally organized church which included among its supporters not only residents of the Camp Creek area but members of the older Tennessee group as well.[17]

For the next six years this little band of believers struggled against both persecution and fanaticism. They endured social ostracism, legal discrimination, threats of physical violence and the destruction of their crude log church but remained steadfast in their faith. Yet the same zeal that had sustained the faithful in the face of persecution ultimately threatened to destroy the church. At the turn of the century, some of the more zealous and impressionable members of the group, apparently influenced by Fire-Baptized apostles, began seeking new and ever more profound religious experiences, including the dynamite, lyddite and osidite baptisms.[18] These devout but misguided worshipers also sought to express their holiness through abstinence from meat, sugar and medicinal herbs. Tension soon developed between these Christians and those less spartan in their habits. Ill-will resulted and the small church nearly succumbed to the internal dissension. In May of 1902, however, as the fanaticisms began to subside, a remnant of the group reorganized itself into a more disciplined and tightly structured body and adopted the name Holiness Church.[19]

This little congregation, having weathered the ordeals of its early years, soon became the mother church of a tiny holiness sect which developed in the mountainous region where Tennessee, Georgia, and North Carolina converge. In 1903 Ambrose Jessup Tomlinson, a former colporteur for the American Bible Society who had settled in Culbertson, North Carolina, in 1899, joined the Camp Creek church. Because of his leadership ability and relative educational superiority, Tomlinson quickly emerged as the leader of this church and the sect which it fostered. Under the guidance of this former Indiana Quaker the Holiness Church spread out of the eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina mountains, first into the foothills of these states and then, within a dozen years, throughout the Southeast and into the Caribbean.[20]

Thus by 1906, three holiness sects, though small, were nevertheless firmly established in the Carolinas. By this time holiness factions had also developed among Free-Will Baptists in eastern North Carolina and Presbyterians in northwestern South Carolina, but these movements were either soon absorbed into the newly emerging denominations or remained small and of only local significance.[21] For all these groups, however, 1906 was to prove a momentous year.

In that year, a new wave of enthusiasm began sweeping the holiness bodies. This new revival originated in Topeka, Kansas, around the turn of the century. There, a holiness preacher and faith healer, Charles Fox Parham, began espousing a new religious doctrine and practice soon to be widely known as pentecostalism. Parham, perhaps influenced by his contact with Irwin in the late eighteen eighties, began teaching that there was a third work of the Holy Spirit subsequent to and distinct from sanctification. This third work of God's grace was the baptism in the Holy Spirit signified, as in Acts 2:4, by speaking in tongues. Parham believed that both the first century apostles and those of the present age received the baptism in the Spirit as an endowment of power for more effective Christian service. His eschatology, like that of many left-wing holiness evangelists, was premillennial. He thus naturally interpreted this third work of grace and the Spiritual gifts which often followed it as God's dispensation to the faithful in the last days. While this blessing might afford spiritual solace, its primary purpose was to assist Christians in evangelizing as much of the world as possible before Christ's cataclysmic return. Hence it was a gift which, theoretically at least, encumbered its recipients with a great responsibility.[22]

Parham's message spread haltingly at first. Not until 1906 when a black evangelist, William Joseph Seymour, carried these new ideas to Los Angeles did they begin to have an impact. Though initially spurned by holiness believers in the West Coast city, Seymour soon established a mission at 312 Azusa Street from which he launched an interracial revival of landmark significance. Within a few months news of the Los Angeles revival had spread through the holiness press. Soon holiness leaders and laymen alike began making their way to southern California to hear more of this new "apostolic faith."[23]

Among the pilgrims was G.B. Cashwell of Dunn, North Carolina, a minister in Crumpler's organization. He heard Seymour preach in the late fall of 1906, received the baptism in the Holy Spirit and within a few weeks was back in North Carolina preparing to launch his own pentecostal revival. On December 31, 1906, he began a month-long meeting in a tobacco warehouse in an industrial section of Dunn. In this revival and subsequent ones held during the next year in the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee Cashwell transformed the southern holiness movement. As a result of his preaching the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, Pentecostal Holiness Church, Church of God, Brewerton Presbyterian Church of northwestern South Carolina and several holiness-oriented Free-Will Baptist Churches in eastern North Carolina accepted the theory and practice of the baptism in the Holy Spirit signified by speaking in tongues. In short, Cashwell had swept practically all the southeastern holiness movement into the pentecostal camp.[24]

The pentecostal revival swept away many of the doctrinal and practical differences among southeastern holiness groups and united them in a common experiential bond. This facilitated mergers among some, especially where there was duplication of effort. Thus in 1911 the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church and the Pentecostal Holiness Church united, adopting the name of the latter organization. This body, especially after its absorption in 1915 of the Tabernacle Pentecostal Church (formerly the Brewerton Presbyterian Church), was for a time the largest pentecostal organization in the Carolinas.[25] Within a few years, however, its supremacy was challenged by the Church of God, ultimately to become the largest white pentecostal body in the Southeast.

Despite opposition ranging from ridicule and ostracism to outright persecution, the membership of the Church of God, the Pentecostal Holiness Church and their schismatic progeny grew steadily during the first four decades of this century. By 1936 the U.S. Bureau of the Census had gathered sufficient data to graphically demonstrate this growth:[26]

Table I.

National Membership Statistics[27]

Sect	1916	1926	1936
Church of God	7,784	23,247	44,818
Tomlinson Church of God	-----	-----	18,351
Pentecostal Holiness Church	5,353	8,096	12,955
Fire-Baptized Holiness Church of God of the Americas	-----	-----	1,651
Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Holiness Church	-----	-----	1,348
Congregational Holiness Church	-----	939	2,167

Table II.

Membership Statistics for South Carolina

Sect	1916	1926	1936
Church of God	89	925	3,289
Tomlinson Church of God	-----	-----	767
Pentecostal Holiness Church	823	1,334	1,943
Fire-Baptized Holiness Church of God of the Americas	-----	-----	588
Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Holiness Church	-----	-----	184
Congregational Holiness Church	-----	61	104

Table III.

Membership Statistics for North Carolina

Sect	1916	1926	1936
Church of God	285	949	3,378
Tomlinson Church of God	-----	-----	1,171
Pentecostal Holiness Church	1,849	2,241	3,447
Fire-Baptized Holiness Church of God of the Americas	-----	-----	432
Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Holiness Church	-----	-----	388
Congregational Holiness Church	-----	-----	105

No satisfying explanation for the success of these and other early pentecostal sects has as yet been developed. Students, correctly sensing the significance of the experiential dimension of the movement, have expended much intellectual energy illuminating the character and function of the psychologically as well as religiously important experiences of justification, sanctification, and the baptism in the Holy Spirit.[28] While this is essential to our understanding of the charismatic revival, scholars have sometimes over-emphasized this aspect of the interpretation of reality to which these experiences lend veracity. The content and function of pentecostalism's belief system are as important as its reorienting and authenticating religious experiences.

An orderly representation of life is a prerequisite both of understanding and of action. As Susanne Langer has observed:

> Man can adapt himself somehow to anything his imagination can cope with; but he can not deal with Chaos. Because his characteristic function and highest asset is conception, his greatest fright is to meet what he can not construe, the 'uncanny,' as it is popularly called. It need not be a new object; we do meet new things, and understand them promptly, if tentatively, by the nearest analogy, when our minds are functioning freely; but under mental stress even perfectly familiar things may become suddenly disorganized and give us the horrors. Therefore our most important assets are always the symbols of our general orientation in nature, on the earth, in society, and in what we are doing.[29]

Man is constantly striving to manipulate these symbols into the most meaningful picture. Psychologist Jean Piaget suggests that this quest for order is no mere preference of the intellect but a functional necessity stemming from fundamental principles governing the operation of human thought.[30] The inability to produce an orderly representation of the world about us inevitably breeds anxiety.

The belief system of pentecostalism was one means by which those who joined the movement arrived at a more satisfying understanding of the world and their place in it. The revival's ideology helped believers cope with the anxiety stemming from the bafflement, pain, and moral uncertainty inherent in the human condition. As anthropologist Clifford Geertz has reminded us, all men are threatened by chaos at these three points in their existence.[31] The poorer people in a society may sometimes be less able to cope with this threat than the more affluent. The economic resources of the latter give them greater access to education, medical services, and the channels of political and social power which have traditionally been the chief means by which man has constructed psychological, physical, and social barriers against the discomfort and uninterpretability of life. Those who have been able to make only limited use of these conventional instrumentalities of their society have frequently become disillusioned and rejected them. Some have sought to make the world more responsive to their needs through social action. Others, making the most of such resources as they possess, have created intellectual and practical systems which have a minimal impact upon society but which transform the way in which they view the world, and thereby make life comprehensible and tolerable. The ideology of pentacostalism is a good example of the latter mode of response.

Most of those who joined the charismatic revival during the early years of the twentieth century were from the low, although not the lowest, economic levels of American society. Many were somewhat disillusioned with the world in which they lived. They viewed the new ideas, peoples, and technology, as well as the economic inequity, political unrest, labor strife, and growing racial tension about them with apprehension. Furthermore, they were sometimes plagued with problems of psychological maladjustment or physical suffering which heightened their anxiety. Perplexed and anxious about the state of the world and their own circumstances, excluded from many of the usual means of coping with these feelings, they despaired of being able either to understand or to deal with the problems they faced. The gospel preached by the charismatic evangelist transformed this despair into hope. Suddenly the world, while it was no more pleasant, at least made sense. Life took on meaning and purpose. This transformation was accomplished by means of a reorienting and authenticating religious experience which lent veracity to an apocalyptic ideology.

Inherent in apocalypticism is both a lack of faith in man and society and a conviction that world conditions can be set right only by divine intervention. Pentecostals, like other premillenarian Christians, believed that Christ would return in a cataclysmic moment inaugurating an age which would be enjoyed by all who had kept the faith. Prior to His Advent, however, the world would be in dire straits. Wars, rumors of wars, natural disasters, hardships, persecution, apostasy, and evil of every type would be rife. Only a few Christians would remain true to their God. This remnant would do His will and proclaim His message of salvation until Christ returned. At that time they would be swept into the Kingdom to dwell with God for eternity while the remainder of mankind received the just reward for their infidelity.

Looking about them, pentecostals perceived a world troubled as never before. Their periodicals are filled with observations on the lamentable state of the church and society. The focal point of their lamentation was often an ill-defined social trend which they dubbed modernism. One commentator wrote of this phenomenon:

> Modernism is not content merely to degrade Christian theology. It must also reach out its filthy hand and touch every vital foundation of civilization. Modernism wrecks the church, breaks the home, degrades the school, lowers moral standards, mocks vital Christianity and destroys the soul.[32]

Convinced of the growth of this corrupting tendency, pentecostals believed that a second Advent was at hand. Although this conviction appears to have begun waning by the latter nineteen thirties, even as late as 1936 many charismatics probably still shared the sentiments of a contributor to the Pentecostal Holiness Advocate who wrote:

> I warn you, judgment is just ahead, the great day is dawning. We can almost see the breaking of the day over the hilltop when we shall soon behold the son of man leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills; coming, yes coming to take away His bride. Praise God. Hallelujah! It will not be long, for He is coming to take away those who have suffered for His name; those who have lived the life and lifted the standard high.[33]

This doctrine involved more than a passive hope for a better lot in the afterlife. Pentecostals believed this imminent return of Christ placed a great responsibility upon all His followers. The baptism in the Holy Spirit was given them, they thought, as an endowment of power for more effective service in the last days. They were to use this power to evangelize as much of the world as possible before countless millions of people were eternally damned at the last judment. An editorial in the initial issue of the Church of God Evangel in March 1910 explained the responsibility incumbent upon every Christian and challenged believers to accept their task:

> The Dark and cloudy day is passing. We are now in the evening of this wonderful gospel age. The sheep must be gathered from all places, where they have been scattered. They are coming as the light is now shining, since the sun has dropped from behind the cloud once more in the western horizon, and is shining brightly, just before dropping behind the hills, which will usher in the night of awful tribulations ...We can expect nothing less in glory and power in the evening light than broke out over the eastern hills in the early morning of the gospel age ...The Holy Spirit was given to the disciples in the morning to give them power to accomplish just what they did accomplish. He is given us today for the same purpose. We dare not falter. We dare not quail. We dare not even fear. The time is short. The harvest is ripe.[34]

Many pentecostals with, as one neophyte expressed it, "the 'go ye' "[35] in their souls rallied to the challenge of their new faith. They employed camp meeting, revival, and Bible school techniques developed earlier in the nineteenth century and revitalized by holiness campaigners. But they did not confine their activities to churches, Bible schools, or even tents. They preached the gospel to "mill hands in their factories, to road gangs by the wayside, to workmen in the railroad yards and iron works, and to farm hands in the cotton fields. They exhorted sinners from courthouse steps and city parks, and in dance halls, gambling houses and 'red light' districts."[36]

The revival's ideology then, portrayed a world in which evil was rampant and the life of the Christian difficult. Yet at the same time, it demonstrated that life was not chaotic. The pain and uncertainty of this life were ephemeral, and the apparent disorder swirling about mankind was an illusion. History was progressing according to God's plan.

The inexplicable, unpleasant, and unjust aspects of human existence were merely signs of God's impending intervention in the affairs of men, at which time all that had been hidden would be made known and an era of peace and joy would be inaugurated. Until the dawn of this new age, Christians were to work diligently to persuade others to avail themselves of God's grace.

This way of looking at life ordered the pentecostals' world, established their identity, and gave them purpose. It transformed the humdrum and often oppressive existence of ordinary people into something of cosmic significance. The charismatics saw themselves as participants in a great apocalyptic drama, the climax of which would be sudden, spectacular, and ultimate. Farmers, laborers, tradesmen, housewives, mothers, young, old, people of all races, suddenly perceived themselves as soldiers of the Lord battling Satan for the souls of men. Christ was their general, the devil their foe, earth their battleground, but heaven their home.

That this ideology provided some persons with a more effective means of coping with life than had their previous belief system seems certain. However, there were innumerable persons experiencing many of the same problems as those who joined the pentecostal movement for whom this religious crusade held no appeal. Why did some people find solace in the charismatic awakening while others did not? A socio-economic answer is inadequate. Pentecostals, while they were often poor, constituted only a small portion of the lower classes. Why then were some attracted to the movement while others were not?

One explanation is found in the fact that pentacostalism initially drew most of its converts not from the unchurched sector of society but from among those for whom religion had previously been an integral part of life. Such persons came to the movement with a predisposition to answer in religious terms many of the questions posed by their experience. For them, religion was already a significant, if not the primary, mode of perception.

Religion generally serves as a kind of arch perspective which encompasses other ways of viewing reality. It answers questions or resolves problems not answered or resolved by other conceptual models. For some, the less adequately developed other interpretive frameworks are, the more directly religion comes into play as a means of understanding the world about one. This seems to have been the case with those who were attracted to pentecostalism. For many, the theology, cosmology, and anthropology inherent in the belief system of their churches was the zenith of their intellectual sophistication. A considerable portion of life was understood in terms of the world view propounded by their conservative fundamentalistic heritage. Although those who joined the charismatic revival were beginning to find certain aspects of this belief system wanting, they retained their tendency to view life in the terms which it formulated. Therefore, when pentecostalism appeared on the scene with a slightly reinterpreted and revitalized version of their accustomed belief system it was only natural that they found it appealing. It enabled them with a minimum of effort and psychological stress to assimilate into basically familiar ways of interpreting the world much of life that had previously seemed unassimilable.

---

[1] "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold!" William Jennings Bryan, in an address delivered to the Democratic National Convention in 1896.

[2] Albert Deems Betts, History of South Carolina Methodism (Columbia, S.C.: The Advocate Press, 1952), p. 412.

[3] For varying interpretations of the role of the doctrine of perfection in the development of American Methodism see: Harold G.A. Lindstrom, Wesley and Sanctification: A Study in the Doctrine of Salvation (Stockholm, 1946), pp. 55-161; Merrill Elmer Gaddis, "Christian Perfectionism in America" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1929), p. 387; Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 115-16; John Peters, Perfection and American Methodism (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 90-101, 121.

[4] Charles Edwin Jones, "Perfectionist Persuasion: A Social Profile of the National Holiness Movement within American

Methodism, 1867-1936" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1968), pp. 74-5.

[5] Timothy L. Smith, Called Unto Holiness (Kansas City, Mo.: Nazarene Publishing House, 1962), p. 27.

[6] Timothy L. Smith, "The Holiness Crusade," in The History of American Methodism, ed. Emory S. Bucks, 3 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1964), 2:608-27.

[7] Vinson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Co., 1971), pp. 50-1.

[8] Frederick Emmanuel Mayer, The Religious Bodies of America (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), p. 307.

[9] Vinson Synan, The Old-Time Power (Franklin Springs, Ga.: The Advocate Press, 1973), pp. 51-2.

[10] Ibid., p. 86.

[11] Ibid., pp. 82-6; Joseph Hillery King, "History of the Pentecostal Holiness Church" (1945-46), pp. 5-7.

[12] Synan, Old-Time Power, pp. 89-90; King, "Pentecostal Holiness Church," pp. 14-19.

[13] Synan, Old-Time Power, pp. 88-9; King, "Pentecostal Holiness Church," pp. 10-12.

[14] Synan, Old-Time Power, pp. 94-8; King, "Pentecostal Holiness Church," pp. 23-5; Interview with Mrs. Joseph H. King, Franklin Springs, Georgia, 19 July 1973.

[15] Synan, Old-Time Power, chap. 4 passim.

[16] Ibid., p. 123.

[17] Charles W. Conn, Like a Mighty Army, Moves the Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.: Church of God Publishing House, 1955), pp. 4-27.

[18] During the late eighteen nineties Benjamin Harden Irwin, founder of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Association, sensing many holiness people's thirst for ever more profound religious experiences, began preaching that there were three works of the Holy Spirit subsequent to the baptism of fire. These he dubbed the dynamite, lyddite and oxidite baptisms. These ideas appear to have been somewhat controversial even among the Fire-Baptized people themselves and were soon abandoned. See King, "Pentecostal Holiness Church," pp. 19-20.

[19] Conn, Like a Mighty Army, pp. 29-45.

[20] *Ibid*., 49-292 *passim*; Homer A. Tomlinson, ed., Diary of A.J. Tomlinson, 3 vols. (New York: The Church of God, World Headquarters, 1949-1955), 1:14-15, 21.

[21] Robert Mapes Anderson, "A Social History of the Early Twentieth Century Pentecostal Movement" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1969), pp. 78-80, 85-6; N.J. Holmes and wife, Life Sketches and Sermons (Royston, Ga.: The Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1920), *passim*.

[22] Anderson, "Early Twentieth Century Pentecostal Movement," pp. 128-37; Neils Bloch-Hoell, The Pentecostal Movement: Its Origin, Development and Character (Copenhagen, 1964), p. 21.

[23] Anderson, "Early Twentieth Century Pentecostal Movement," pp. 97-9; Klaude Kendrick, The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1961), pp. 64-6; James S. Tenney, "Black Origins of the Pentecostal Movement," Christianity Today (October 8, 1971): 4.

[24] Synan, Old-Time Power, pp. 107-12, 114-15.

[25] *Ibid*., pp. 128-31; Joseph E. Campbell, History of the Pentecostal Holiness Church (Franklin Springs, Ga.: The Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1951), pp. 265-66.

[26] U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Religious Bodies, 2 vols: 1916, 1926, 1936. 1916: 1:36, 37, 205, 219; 1926: 1:226, 248, 278, 284, 322; 1936: 1:259-60, 284, 318, 322, 330, 375, 383, 384, 412, 746, 750, 890, 894.

[27] Tomlinson Church of God originated with schism in Church of God-Cleveland, Tennessee, in 1923, as a result of impeachment proceedings against A.J. Tomlinson; Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Holiness Church was reorganized at Pembroke, North Carolina, on October 21, 1916, as a result of a schism in the Pentecostal Holiness Church over the dress and dietary code of the PHC; the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church of God of the Americas was organized in 1908 as a result of the withdrawal of black members from the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church; the Congregational Holiness Church was organized January 29, 1921, at High Shoals, Georgia, as a result of schism within the Pentecostal Holiness Church over the doctrine of faith healing.

[28] For further insight into the characteristic pentecostal experience of speaking tongues, or glossolalia, see: Virginia H. Hine, "Pentecostal Glossalalia, Toward a Functional Interpretation," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 8, no. 2 (Fall 1969) and John P. Kildahl, The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

[29] Susanne Langer, Philosophy in a New Key, cited by Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System," in Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion, ed. Michael Banton (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), p. 14.

[30] For a brief analysis of Piaget's thought on this subject, see: Barry J. Wadsworth, Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development: An Introduction for Students of Psychology and Education (New York: David McKay Co., 1971).

[31] Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System," p. 14.

[32] "Modernism," Pentecostal Holiness Advocate (December 2, 1937): 3.

[33] Jimmy Frazier, "The End is Near, Even at the Door," Pentecostal Holiness Advocate (October 22, 1931): 5.

[34] Church of God Evangel (March 1, 1910): 1.

[35] Emma Payne to editor, Church of God Evangel (January 21, 1922): 2.

[36] Anderson, "Early Twentieth Century Pentecostal Movement," p. 120.

THE DUEL IN NINETEENTH CENTURY SOUTH CAROLINA: CUSTOM OVER WRITTEN LAW

Nancy Torrance Matthews

In South Carolina in the nineteenth century, there were two sets of law: the written law and the Code of Honor. The written law pertained to the business of the state and to the punishment of criminal activities, while the Code of Honor provided for the settlement of personal disputes between gentlemen. Popularized by visiting Frenchmen during the American Revolution, duelling existed in South Carolina for more than a century.[1] As early as 1812 there were strong anti-duelling statutes on the state's law books, but the practice continued to flourish until 1880 because respectable members of society approved of the duel, as an acceptable means of redressing personal insults. With the erosion of the public approval in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the practice of duelling lost its respectability, and hence its basis of support; until that time, however, the written law had been powerless to prevent the practice or to punish the participants.[2]

The custom of duelling in South Carolina, as in other aristocratic societies, was an affair of the upper classes. Those men who ruled the state, as well as those who aspired to such positions of power and prestige, believed most strongly in the legitimacy of the Code Duello. Two historians, Harnett Kane and Charles Sydnor, maintain that part of the reason for duelling's wide acceptance by those members of society was the particular social, economic, and political condition of the state in the nineteenth century.[3] A small group of men, slaveholders, held power all out of proportion to their numbers. In their efforts to assure their hegemony against what Sydnor calls "a constant threat by a subordinate force," the slave population, the slaveholders became in essence the law in South Carolina, governing their own lives by a set of unwritten rules based upon honor.[4] According to Kane, "a slavery civilization bred a habit of command that approached the lordly."[5] On their plantations, the slaveowners held life and death power over their slaves.

Through the system of deference, the planter elite dominated the "poor whites, small farmers, artisans and school teachers" politically, socially, and economically.[6] Within the legal sphere, this small group of men controlled the legislature in which the laws were made and comprised the judiciary from which the laws were enforced. Such familiarity nurtured contempt and disregard for the written law whenever it conflicted with the Code of Honor.

Since the custom of duelling prevailed over the execution of the anti-duelling laws for most of the nineteenth century, the nature of duelling in South Carolina is best revealed through a scrutiny of the social aspects of the Code Duello.[7]

Under the patronage of the upper classes, distinguishing customs and conventions developed, making the duel in South Carolina unique. The state even had its own set of "regulations" for duelling. In 1832, John Lyde Wilson, a former governor and well-known duellist, compiled and published "The Code of Honor; or Rules for the Government of Principals and Seconds in Duelling."[8] A strong believer in the necessity of duelling, Wilson declared that nine-tenths of all duels resulted from a lack of experience on the part of the seconds.[9] The Code was his answer to the need of an authoritative guide for those gentlemen involved in a duelling situation.

Wilson recommended that the gentleman receiving the insult take no public notice of the slight until he chose a competent friend to serve as his second; the second was the guardian of his honor and took charge of all communications with the second of the other gentleman involved. Wilson instructed the seconds to seek a peaceful resolution, if at all possible, but warned them not to take too lightly an insult given over a wine table, as drunkenness might have been a pretext to avoid redress. If the result of the communications between the seconds of the gentlemen involved was a challenge and an acceptance, the seconds handled all details as to the date, time, and place of the duel, the weapons involved (usually pistols), position and distance of the principals on the duelling field, signals, and the number of witnesses. At the duelling site, the seconds were in complete control: walking off the distance, positioning the principals, loading the pistols, and giving the signals. They carried pistols themselves, to enforce the rules of fair play. The second of the challenger determined at what point in the duel the insult had been satisfied. If, after the first shots, no one was injured and the insult was slight, the duel was peaceably ended; however, if the insult was grave, the second could insist upon the continuation of the affair until one or the other principals fell. In any case, an injury immediately ended the affair.[10]

Wilson's "Code of Honor" was an adaptation of the "Irish Code Duello," adopted in 1777. The South Carolina version differed in that blows could be exchanged, family participation was forbidden, surgeons were allowed on the field, social inequality was an excuse for the refusal of a challenge, and those men who refused a proper challenge--between social peers--could be publicly posted as cowards.[11] Perhaps the biggest difference was that it forbade direct communication between the antagonists that could serve to exasperate the situation. The fact that Wilson's Code was reprinted several times between 1838 and 1858 indicates its acceptance by duellists in the state.[12]

Several unwritten rules pertained to the custom of duelling in South Carolina. A gentleman never sought redress for a personal insult in a court of law; slanders and libels were to be appeased only on the field of honor. In such affairs, a gentleman sought no advantage over his opponent in any detail of the affair. Furthermore, a gentleman never issued a challenge to, nor received one from, his social inferiors; these men were either horsewhipped or caned.[13] Such was the case in the Sumner-Brooks affair in 1856. Preston Brooks redressed what he deemed to be an insult by Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. Before accosting Sumner at his desk on the Senate floor and caning him senseless, Brooks had deliberated two days on the method of punishment, considering caning, cowhiding, or horsewhipping. Obviously Brooks felt that no social equality existed between himself and Sumner, or he would have challenged Sumner to a duel.[14]

Duelling was such a frequent activity in the state between 1770 and 1880 that it achieved a status similar to other gentlemanly sports. Most cities and towns had their favorite duelling grounds: islands in the middle of a river in the upper part of the state, the Race Course in Camden, Pidgeon Point in Beaufort, the Washington Race Course and a small park on Broad Street in Charleston.[15] For those South Carolinians who felt some twinge of conscience about the legal prohibitions after 1812, points just outside the state, such as the Sandbar Ferry in Savannah, served as duelling sites.[16] The last reported duel in Charleston was fought in the street, but not all duels were so "down-to-earth." Two men on Legare Street fought an early morning duel through the upstairs windows of their respective houses. The result of the bloodless exchange was merely a few shattered panes of glass, and each man went down to breakfast, satisfied that his honor had been upheld.[17]

Some men acquired reputations for their expertise in the field and were sought by other men eager for instruction in the deadly art. John Wilson was one such individual. John Ashe gained repute for his knowledge of the procedures involved in duelling, and near the end of his life, wrote that he had personally referred fifty-one affairs of honor.[18] Chapman Levy, a Camden lawyer and noted duellist, was also sought as a trainer and an advisor.[19]

Certain cities were especially recognized as centers of duelling. Charleston even boasted a duelling society in the early part of the nineteenth century. The leadership of this club was based upon the number of persons the member had killed or wounded in his duelling career. The society's demise came when the president, supposedly the best and the most prolific duellist, was fatally wounded in an affair of honor; his last request was that the society disband.[20] The city of Camden was also somewhat of a headquarters for duelling in the state. Besides seeking the advice of the trainer-in-residence, Chapman Levy, prospective duellists came to Camden to take target practice at the Iron Man. The Iron Man, a steel figure one-half inch thick of the side stance of a man, was wrought in 1845 prior to a duel between two Camden "hotspurs," Col. James P. Dickenson and Maj. John Smart. For practice, Dickenson had the local blacksmith make the figure specifically to the exact size of Smart's side view. When the duel ended in a peaceful reconciliation, the iron figure was unceremoniously dumped in the Factory Pond on the edge of town. A few years later, when the pond was drained, the Iron Man emerged erect; it was recovered and returned to its prior employment.[21] So popular was this form of practice that men who accepted or issued a challenge were said to be "going to the iron man."[22]

Pistols achieved wide acceptance among the duelling set. Duelling pistols, designed by 1770, met the need for a specialized, precision weapon that was light, easy to handle, with a firm grip. Some duelling enthusiasts had their pistols custom-made, with the grip and weight specifically tailored to their precise size and strength; the logic of such exactitude was that the gun would handle as a natural extension of the arm. The most important characteristic of a good gun was that it "come up and point" at a particular target without being formally aimed. This peculiarity was not of insignificant value since aiming required time and a steady hand, neither of which was readily available in a duelling situation; and furthermore, society looked rather unfavorably upon formal aiming.[23]

Not every gentleman called upon to duel owned a fine pair of duelling pistols. Frequently such weapons had to be borrowed for the occasion. Some guns gained wide reputations for their murderous capabilities, such as the pair of pistols owned by Edward Harleston of Pendleton; this pair was so celebrated for their deadly accuracy that duellists came from as far as sixty or seventy miles to use them. In both the Samuel Carson-Robert Vance duel in 1827 and the Turner Bynum-Benjamin Perry affair in 1832, Harleston's pistols were involved. Both of the victims, Vance and Bynum, were fatally wounded when they were hit one-half inch above the point of the hip, which was one of the choicest and deadliest spots.[24]

Gentlemen of almost every profession engaged in the practice of duelling: military men, editors, politicians, lawyers, doctors, students. There was even a case involving an Episcopal minister, although he seems to have been an exception among that particular profession.[25]

Among military men, national allegiance did not preclude the issuance or acceptance of a challenge when the parties involved deemed it necessary. General Francis Marion agreed to a duel with General McIlraith of the British Navy during the American Revolution; but before the duel could be fought, McIlraith backed down after having heard of Marion's ferocious temper.[26] The fact that they were fighting for the same side did not prevent Generals Robert Howe and Christopher Gadsen from meeting on the field of honor in 1778; fortunately for the American cause, both men fired wild shots.[27] Unlike social position, military rank was no reason for the refusal of a challenge. In 1862, Maj. Alfred Rhett fatally wounded Col. Ransom Calhoun, the commander of Fort Sumter, after challenging him to a duel. Rhett shortly thereafter assumed command of the fort.[28] Even prisoners of war engaged in the custom of duelling. William Grayson, in his autobiography, mentioned that some Charlestonians imprisoned on Mt. Pleasant during the Revolution held duels as a means of relieving "the tediousness of captivity in a way comfortable to soldierly pursuits."[29] The duel he described resulted from an incident concerning chickens and a cabbage patch.

Duelling was one of the hazards of the newspaper business in South Carolina in the nineteenth century. More often than they preferred, editors found themselves in duelling situations because they were held responsible for whatever appeared in their papers whether they wrote it or not, and nothing was italicized to indicate that it was a quote. Some editors went so far as to refuse to print references to local persons who might take umbrage.[30] No wonder political cartoons of the day showed the Southern editor with a pen in one hand and a pistol in the other.[31] Benjamin Perry, a Unionist and later the provisional governor of the state during Reconstruction, was challenged several times during the Nullification controversy of the 1830's. In 1832, Perry himself challenged a Nullificationist editor, Turner Bynum, because of an editorial in Bynum's paper that attacked Perry's integrity.[32] Two Charleston editors, J.L. Hatch of the Charleston Standard and John Cunningham of the Evening News, engaged in a bloodless affair in 1856 on the account of an editorial in the News concerning the Brooks-Sumner fray.[33]

The court room proved dangerous grounds for lawyers because irate relatives often took offense to their remarks. Chapman Levy discovered that he had offended the Taylor family name in his prosecution of the brother of Governor Taylor when he was challenged by the defendant's nephew.[34]

Other highly placed and respected men of the community were members of the duelling set. In August of 1771, Doctor John Haley and Peter Delancy, Postmaster General for the Southern District of North America, continued their long-standing political argument, which always began anew whenever they were "heated with liquor." On that fateful day, they decided to terminate the dispute with a duel, so they called for another bottle of whiskey and locked themselves in a small room in the Charleston bar. Delancy was fatally wounded and, according to one witness, had to be buried the following morning because the weather was quite warm and his body was rapidly deteriorating from being "overheated ...with liquor and passion."[35] Judge Daniel E. Huger always carried his pistol with him in the event that he might be called upon to defend his honor. Upon his arrival in Columbia as a newly elected state senator, the City Fathers required him to post a peace bond, to prevent his participation in a duel while in Columbia.[36]

Young men, imitating their elders, found adequate reasons to defend their honor on the duelling field, often with tragic consequences. Two students at South Carolina College in 1833, John Adams and Govan Roach, quarreled over a plate of trout which somehow represented an insult. In the duel that followed, Roach shot and killed his best friend.[37]

Gentlemen who duelled did so for the sake of honor. Jack Kenny Williams, in his essay on duelling in the antebellum period, offers insight into the reasons for which a man might send or accept a challenge that could end his own life or make him responsible for the death of another man:

> The insult, real or presumed, was the classic call to a duel in South Carolina. To insinuate that a man used the truth loosely was to invite a challenge. To make disparaging remarks about his family, his friends, his business activity or his status in society was equally serious.[38]

Hamilton Cochran, in Noted American Duels and Hostile Encounters, suggests that "the quickest way to invite a challenge in days gone by was to hint that a man's wife, sister, aunt, or even grandmother (not to mention his lady friends) was not quite as pure as the driven snow."[39]

Those men who approved of the practice of duelling rationalized their position by claiming that the duel performed a vital function in the community. They claimed that the duel "encouraged courtesy among men, preserved domestic relations and stimulated the peaceful community life" because it curbed loose talk and false words.[40] Pro-duellists argued that, while in operation, the duel contributed to the creation of a society of courteous, respectful people with high morals and refined manners, and promoted decent intercourse among citizens.[41] In 1872, forty years after his encounter with Bynum, Perry wrote that, although it had been a painful experience, the duel had been necessary because "when a man knows that he is to be held accountable for his want of courtesy, he is not so apt to indulge in abuse."[42] For those who supported the custom of duelling, the Code of Honor provided gentlemen with a means of guarding their personal honor, as well as the honor of their women, areas in which they believed the written law was powerless to defend.

Not all South Carolinians approved of duelling as a proper means of settling disputes; yet, in a society that generally enforced the acceptance of a challenge by allowing a man who refused to duel to be publicly posted as a coward and exiled from polite company, there were few men who could openly decline a challenge and survive socially. The Carolina planter, Henry Laurens, disapproved of duelling but engaged in several affairs of honor. However, with his pistol loaded only with powder, he always shot to the side. His reasoning for such actions was that "I have bravery enough to stand to be shot but was too great a coward to kill any man."[43] Yet there were some men who could refuse a challenge with no social repercussions because their reputations were such that the community refused to brand them cowards. Included among this group were the South Carolina jurist, William Henry Drayton, the Southern fire-eater, Robert Barnwell Rhett, and Capt. F.W. Dawson, editor of the Charleston News and Courier.

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney participated in two duels in his early years, but expressed great opposition to the practice of duelling following the death of Alexander Hamilton in a duel in 1804. Pinckney led the Society of the Cincinnati in a campaign to have duelling outlawed, arguing that "Duelling is no criterion for bravery." "I have seen cowards fight duels and I am convinced that real courage may be better shown in the refusal than in the acceptance of a challenge."[44]

Led by clergymen and other respectable members of the community, anti-duelling societies were formed when groups of citizens could no longer quietly accept the frequent duels. Each member pledged to take all measures necessary to prevent any duel that came to his attention, and neither to issue nor accept a challenge himself. Charleston, a center for duelling, had a rather ineffective anti-duelling society in 1826, as part of the efforts of the Society of the Cincinnati.[45] Camden sponsored an anti-duelling society in 1829, following a particularly tragic duel, and the society was reorganized in 1879 in response to an increasing number of duels at that time. Its avowed purpose was to educate and organize "the public opinion and moral sense of the people to a true perception of the criminality of the wicked and pernicious practice," and to make all necessary efforts to settle personal difficulties that might lead to a duel while using all legal means to prevent it.[46]

Those men who opposed the Code Duello argued that instead of building a peaceful society, duelling threatened to destroy society by promoting intolerance and lawlessness, and disrupting the right of free speech.[47] Dr. David Ramsay, a spokesman for antiduellists in the early part of the century, complained that "the important question of right and wrong, of character and reputation is left to the decision of the best marksman;" more often than not, the deceased was a decent young man afraid of being called a coward.[48] Dr. Ramsay accused duellists of taking their honor too seriously and seeking satisfaction for "mere trifles."[49] Some men, interested in the area's economic development, blamed the practice of duelling for the economic poverty of South Carolina by preventing the immigration of capital and labor into the state.[50]

The efforts of the anti-duellists were finally rewarded in the latter half of the century when the respectability of the duel in South Carolina was destroyed, and public opinion demanded the enforcement of the anti-duelling laws. The catalyst for this success was the Cash-Shannon duel of 5 July 1880. In February of 1880, Col. Ellerbe Boggan Crawford

Cash had accused Col. William M. Shannon of tarnishing the "spotless character" of Mrs. Cash in the recent trial of her brother, during which Shannon had been the attorney for the other party.[51] Shannon refused several challenges issued by Cash and other members of his family. However, in June of 1880, a series of scandalous poems, the "Camden Soliloquies," allegedly about Shannon, appeared in the local newspaper. Shannon blamed Cash for the appearance of the poems, challenged him, and was fatally wounded in the resulting duel.[52]

The duel and the death of Shannon unleashed a storm of public protest. In addition to the efforts of the Camden Anti-Duelling Society, the Charleston News and Courier, under the leadership of Capt. F.W. Dawson, took up the fight. For days the paper published eye-witness accounts of the duel as well as editorials and letters from concerned citizens all over the state which accused Cash of goading Shannon into a duel, condemned the present state of duelling in South Carolina, and called for the enforcement of the anti-duelling laws.[53] One anonymous writer, calling himself Champion, announced that the end of the reign of the Code was at hand:

> Thus we must concede that the maintenance of honor by the club system must fall to the ground because with one hand it opens the door of social tone and refinement to any bully who can send or provoke a challenge and with the other hand it shuts the door full in the face of those higher principles of law and order that alone give security to society.[54]

Excerpts from other papers around the state confirmed those sentiments. Indeed, only one paper, the Greenville Daily News, supported Col. Cash and the Code of Honor.[55]

The public uproar generated by the Cash-Shannon duel brought immediate results from the legislature. On 24 December 1880, less than six months after the duel, the South Carolina General Assembly passed a new law in regard to duelling, which provided stiff penalties for those persons found guilty of participation in a duel, and required additional, anti-duelling oaths of all state and county officers.[56]

Cash was tried before the General Sessions Court three times between October 1880 and July 1881, and was finally acquitted of the murder of William Shannon. Public reaction to the outcome was mixed; some papers outside the state and some South Carolinians felt that the decision was typical of the general disregard for the law in the state, and insisted that the jury be publicly reprimanded.[57] Dawson and his followers, however, were not disheartened by the verdict. They believed that the decision would serve as fair warning to those gentlemen contemplating an affair of honor that the public would no longer condone such conduct. As Dawson saw it, Cash had suffered enough from the notoriety of the trial, and it would not have been fair to make him the scapegoat for the increasing public sentiment against duelling.[58]

The public revolt in 1880 was not the result of a simple revulsion to the Cash-Shannon duel, but was the culmination of a gradual shift away from support of the duel since the end of the Civil War. One important reason for the decline in the popularity of duelling was that the war and its aftermath caused tremendous upheaval and displacement in the society, politics, and economics of the state. The plantation system was destroyed and with it the planter hegemony and the system of deference.[59] Indeed, the social setting in which duelling had flourished was now destroyed. Men came back from the war, tired of fighting, having already proved their courage on the fighting field. Also, new men came to power, who had no part in the pre-war ruling class, who took the Code far less seriously than did members of the old regime, and who saw little dishonor in refusing to participate in a practice they considered archaic.

The decline in race relations during the years immediately after the Redemption also had a substantial impact on the erosion of public opinion. After 1877, many persons perceived the need to present a unified white front against any encroachment of social or political institutions by blacks as had occurred during Reconstruction. Black men were seen as the common enemy, and fighting between white men interfered with that image of unity. A Winnsboro resident pleaded for the end of duelling in 1881: "Society at this present time can not allow itself to be distracted and rent by the spectacle of two /white/ men endeavoring to shoot each other down."[60]

There may be other reasons for the shift in public opinion, but what is important is that once the public opinion was firmly behind the execution of the law, those gentlemen seeking respectability and public office, the primary participants in duelling, were forewarned that unless they obeyed the written law, they would receive neither the respect nor the office that they sought. The Cash-Shannon duel of 1880 crystallized public opposition to the duel, and, as a result, was the last duel of any significance in South Carolina. Thus, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Code of Honor, as the honorable means of settling personal disputes between gentlemen, came to an end, and the custom of duelling was no longer considered the sport of gentlemen but the conduct of criminals.

---

[1] Jack Kenny Williams, "The Code of Honor in Antebellum South Carolina," South Carolina Historical Magazine, LIV (1953), 113.

[2] Charles S. Sydnor, "The Southerner and the Law," Journal of Southern History, VI (Feb., 1940), 19.

[3] Ibid., 15-16. Harnett Thomas Kane, Gentlemen, Swords and Pistols (New York: Morrow, 1961), xiii.

[4] Sydnor, 15.

[5] Kane, xii.

[6] Sydnor, 16.

[7] Michael Hindus, in his book, Prison and Plantation: Criminal Justice in Nineteenth Century Massachusetts and South Carolina (University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D., 1975), has an extensive discussion of the legal aspects of duelling in South Carolina.

[8] Don Carlos Seitz, Famous American Duels (New York: Thomas Cromwell Company, 1929), pp. 33-34. Harris H. Mullen, The Cash Shannon Duel (Tampa: Trend House, 1963), p. 26.

[9] Mullen, pp. 26-27, 29.

[10] *Ibid*., pp. 26-42. The rules presented in this paper are found in their entirety in the back of Mullen's book.

[11] Seitz, pp. 33-34. Hamilton Cochran, *Noted American Duels and Hostile Encounters* (Philadelphia: Chilton Books, 1960), pp. 19-20.

[12] Cochran, p. 19.

[13] Williams, 115, 120-121. Sydnor, 17. Mrs. St. Julian Ravenel, *Charleston, the Place and the People* (New York: MacMillan and Company, 1912), p. 411.

[14] Sydnor, 21-22. For another view of Brooks's reasons for the choice of caning, see Robert Neil Mathis, "Preston Smith Brooks: The Man and his Image," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, LXXIX (1978), 304.

[15] Kane, x-xi. David Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*, Vol. III (New York: American Historical Society, 1934), p. 89. William Oliver Stevens, *Charleston, City of Gardens* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1940), p. 241. Mullen, p. 16.

[16] Wallace, p. 89. Mullen, p. 16.

[17] Stevens, p. 241.

[18] Williams, 118.

[19] *Ibid*.

[20] Cochran, pp. 232-233.

[21] Mullen, center page. Thomas J. Kirkland and Robert M. Kennedy, *Historic Camden*, Part II: *Nineteenth Century* (Columbia: The State Company, 1926), pp. 233-235.

[22] Williams, 118.

[23] Harold K. Peterson and Robert Elman, *The Great Guns* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, Inc., 1971), pp. 69-73.

[24] Samuel Gaillard Stoney, ed., "Landgon Cheves Papers," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, XLVII (1946), 70.

[25] Williams mentions the case of an Episcopal minister who had to post a peace bond because of his pending participation in a duel. Whether or not he actually duelled is unknown. 117.

[26] Sidney Ulmer, "Eighteenth Century South Carolinians and the Duel," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, LX (1959), 17. Ravenel, p. 412.

[27] Ulmer, 2. The two men duelled because of Gadsen's criticism of Howe's conduct in the Georgia campaign of 1778. *South Carolina and American General Gazette*, September 3, 1778.

[28] Stevens, p. 241

[29] Samuel Gaillard Stoney, ed., "Autobiography of William Graydon," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, XLVIII (1947), 128.

[30] Williams, 116, 122.

[31] Clement, Eaton, *Freedom of Thought in the Old South* (New York: Peter Smith, 1951), p. 163.

[32] Eaton, p. 163. Mary Stevenson, ed., *Diary of Clarissa Adger Brown: Ashtabula Plantation 1865 and the Pendleton-Clemson Area, South Carolina 1776-1889* (Pendleton: Research and Publication Committee, Foundation for Historic Restoration in Pendleton Area, 1973), p. 36. Beth Ann Klosky, *The Pendleton Legacy* (Columbia: Sandlapper Press, Inc., 1971), p. 26. Lillian Adele Kibler, *Benjamin F. Perry: South Carolina Unionist* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1946), pp. 109-129. Richard Newman Brackett, *Old Stone Church* (Old Stone Church and Cemetery Association with the cooperation of the Andrew Pickens and Cateechee Chapters DAR, 1972), p. 180. Bynum was killed in the duel and buried at the Old Stone Church, Pendleton.

[33] William L. King, *The Newspaper Presses of Charleston, South Carolina* (Charleston: Edward Perry Book Press, 1872), pp. 162-163.

[34] Edwin J. Scott, Random Recollections of a Long Life (Columbia: C.A. Calvo, Jr., 1884), pp. 71-72.

[35] Mabel L. Webber, ed., "Extract from the Journal of Mrs. Ann Manigault, 1754-1781," South Carolina Historical Magazine, XXI (1920), 21. Maurice Grouse, ed., "Letter-book of Peter Manigault," South Carolina Historical Magazine, LXX (1969), 189-190. South Carolina and American Gazette, August 19; October 14; and November 4, 1771.

[36] Williams, 115.

[37] William Walker, "The South Carolina College Duel of 1833," South Carolina Historical Magazine, LII (1951), 140-141.

[38] Williams, 115.

[39] Cochran, p. 30.

[40] Kane, xii.

[41] Ulmer, 9.

[42] Kibler, 135.

[43] Williams, 127.

[44] Seitz, p. 106.

[45] Williams, 122-127.

[46] Charleston News and Courier, July 7, 1880.

[47] Stoney, "Autobiography of William Graydon," 128.

[48] David Ramsay, David Ramsay's History of South Carolina, Vol. I (Newberry, S.C.: W.J. Duffy, 1858), p. 126.

[49] Ibid., p. 36.

[50] News and Courier, July 7, 1880.

[51] Ellerbe Boggan Crawford Cash, The Cash Shannon Duel, ed. by Bessie Cash Irby (Boykin, S.C.: 1930), p. 10. News and Courier, July 7, 1880.

[52] Mullen, pp. 3-7. Cash, pp. 6-8, 10-11, 13, 15. Zalin B. Grant, "The Cash Shannon Duel of July 5, 1880," The Cheraw Chronicle, August 22, 1968. The author of the poems was Boggan Cash, the son of Col. Cash. The last two verses of the Soliloquies:

My Daddy was a gin-maker--Damn such occupation.
I can live by swindling--and on my reputation.
My Daddy was a gin-maker--No fighting man was he
And as long as I have legs to run--No man will shoot
  at me.

[53] News and Courier, July 7; July 9; July 16, 1880.

[54] Ibid., July 13, 1880.

[55] Greenville Daily News, July 15, 1880, Cash, p. 22.

[56] Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session of 1880. (Columbia: James Woodrow State Printer, 1881), pp. 501-502.

[57] News and Courier, June 28, 1881.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Richard Maxwell Brown, Strain of Violence (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1975), pp. 11-12. Williams, 128.

[60] News and Courier, June 28, 1881.

The editors would like to thank Mrs. Dale A. (Ruth) Losier for her dedication and hard work in the typing of and preparation for the printing of the *Proceedings*.

The South Carolina Historical Association supplies *The Proceedings* to all its members. The Executive Committee elects the Editor. Beginning in 1935, every fifth number contains an index for the

The editors of *The P*
responsibility for s
fact or opinion, mad
Choice of style is t
of the contributor.